English edition of
PROBLEMS OF PEACE AND SOCIALISM

Theoretical and information journal of Communist and Workers' Parties throughout the world

BLISHED IN PRAGUE WORKERS OF ALL LANDS UNITE

)LUME 20 JANUARY 1977 NO. 1

CONTENTS

PROBLEMS OF PEACE AND SOCIALISM

is also published in Arabic, Bengali, Bulgarian, Czech, Danish, Finnish, French, Germ Greek, Hebrew, Hindi, Hungarian, Italian, Japanese, Malayalam, Mongolian, Norweg Persian, Polish, Portuguese, Punjabi, Romanian, Russian, Singhalese, Spanish, Swed Tamilnad, Turkish and Vietnamese.

Enquiries for subscriptions to any of these editions should be sent to Press Circulat Agency, Thakurova 3, 16616 Prague 6, Czechoslovakia.

Published by S. C. Easton, 16 King Street, London, W.C.2., and printed by Farleigh Press (T.U.) Ltd., Watf

To our Readers

ar Friends,

The Editorial Board, Editorial Council and international staff of *World Marxist eview* convey best wishes for the New Year. We wish you good health, happiness and ccess in your particular field.

We wish to thank all readers for their suggestions and remarks, which help to improve e journal, and we thank everyone who contributed to its circulation. We look forward to ll closer contacts with our readers in the New Year. We welcome more letters, articles, tes on the thoughts and deeds of the working people and Communists in all the five ntinents.

In offering our opening issue of 1977, we assure you that the journal will continue to ntribute to internationalist co-operation and solidarity of fraternal Communist and orkers' parties and to the unity of all the progressive and anti-imperialist forces working r peace, security and social progress.

In line with the recommendations of Communist and Workers parties, we will continue tively to popularise the ideas of scientific socialism, share in the creative elaboration of jor problems of Marxist-Leninist theory and keep readers in touch with activities of ternal parties.

May the New Year—the year of the 60th anniversary of the Great October Socialist volution—be marked by new victories in the struggle for the triumph of the great ideas Marx, Engels and Lenin, for peace, democracy, national liberation and socialism.

Happy New Year, Comrades.

For New Frontiers in Detente, for Stronger Security and Broader Co-operation in Europe

S already reported in the press, the Political Consultative Committee (PCC) of the arsaw Treaty Organisation met in Bucharest towards the close of November. The eting was attended by delegates from the following countries: the People's Republic of lgaria, led by Todor Zhivkov, First Secretary, CC BCP and Chairman of the State uncil; the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic, led by Gustav Husak, General Secretary, C CPCz and President of the Republic; the German Democratic Republic, led by Erich necker, General Secretary, CC SUPG and Chairman of the State Council; the ngarian People's Republic, led by Janos Kadar, First Secretary, CC HSWP; the Polish ople's Republic, led by Edward Gierek, First Secretary, CC PUWP; the Socialist public of Rumania, led by Nicolae Ceausescu, General Secretary, RCP and President the Republic; the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, led by Leonid Brezhnev, General cretary, CC CPSU.

Established in accordance with the Treaty of Friendship, Co-operation and Mutual sistance the socialist countries concluded in Warsaw on May 14, 1955, the Political nsultative Committee is the supreme political authority of the Warsaw Treaty ganisation. Its jurisdiction includes consultations between member states and amination of problems that arise in the course of implementing the Treaty.

In the more than 20-year history of the Warsaw Treaty Organisation, its Political nsultative Committee adopted such documents as the Declaration on strengthening ace and security in Europe (Bucharest 1966). Appeal of the Warsaw Treaty states to all

European countries (Budapest 1969), Statement on questions pertaining to the strengthening of security and the development of peaceful co-operation in Europe (Berlin 1970), Declaration on peace, security and co-operation in Europe (Prague 1972), Communique of the Political Consultative Committee meeting of the Warsaw Treaty Organisation (Warsaw 1974).

The participants in the November 1976 PCC Bucharest meeting unanimously adopted the declaration "For the Further Advancement of Detente and the Consultation on Security and Development of Co-operation in Europe." There was an exchange of views on the problems involved in the continued struggle for peace and extension of detente. The leaders of the Warsaw Treaty countries noted that events since the Helsinki Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe have confirmed the vast positive significance of its results and of the obligations assumed by its participants under the Final Act.

The obligation undertaken by all the states that signed the Final Act not to be the first to use nuclear weapons against each other, the Bucharest conference noted, accords with the strengthening of peace, security and trust among countries and peoples. It was decided to submit the draft treaty approved by the meeting, together with the appropriate appeal of the Warsaw Treaty countries, to all other countries represented at Helsinki for their consideration.

With a view to perfecting the mechanism of political co-operation within the framework of the Warsaw Treaty, it was decided to set up a Foreign Ministers Committee and a joint secretariat as organs of the Political Consultative Committee.

The PCC conference was held in an atmosphere of complete mutual understanding, fraternal friendship and close co-operation. The discussion demonstrated the identity of views of the Warsaw Treaty countries on fundamental problems of world politics and reaffirmed their community of aims in the struggle for peace and socialism, international co-operation and friendship among the peoples.

World Marxist Review intends to publish in one of its early issues an article on the results of the Bucharest meeting.

Some Lessons of Socialist Construction in Hungary

JANOS KADAR

First Secretary. CC Hungarian Socialist Workers' Party

SUCH events in Hungary's modern history as the proclamation of the Hungarian Soviet Republic in 1919; the fascist Horthy regime between the two world wars; the second victory of working-class power in 1948, after the country's liberation; the 1956 counter-revolutionary rising and its subsequent suppression, show that the class struggle in Hungary has often been extremely intensive and has clear and unforgettable lessons for us.

The path traversed by our Party and working class was not an easy one. In our long struggle successes alternated with setbacks. The facts show that the Party has drawn the necessary lessons and that our working class and people emerged from these ordeals with added strength. The 11th Congress of the HSWP in the spring of 1975 had every right to declare, in its assessment of the situation: "Over the past 20 years the internal situation has been stable, development has been steady and dynamic, the people accept the Party's leadership, working-class power and the positions of socialism are strong and durable. Our republic is successfully building a developed socialist society."

The Congress adopted a programme statement setting out the main tasks for the next 15-20 years, emphasising that this will carry us a long way towards our ultimate goal of a classless communist society. The Congress consolidated and, in conformity with the new

quirements developed, the Party's general political line forged in momentous struggles, ormulated the key principles of our policy and singled out the essential elements in our ractical activity. I propose to discuss some of these elements.

Patriotism—Internationalism

The revolutionary vanguard of the Hungarian working class, our Party has from its ery inception, in November 1918, been a patriotic and internationalist Party, and under ll circumstances has consistently remained true to these principles. Now, in building ocialist society, it considers it its priority duty to take account both of our specific ational conditions and of the common international regularities of building socialism.

The Hungarian people enjoy national independence and sovereignty; exploitation of an by man has been abolished; a developed socialist society is being built, and socialist atriotism has become a moral code. The Party and working class, which play the leading ole in our society, give expression to our national interests, are the inheritors and ontinuers of Hungary's progressive traditions, the custodians of all the genuine values of ur national past. Our Party deems it its duty to maintain and enhance respect for these rogressive traditions, especially by the young generation. Effective patriotism is a great imulating force in building socialism. The people's acceptance of the building of eveloped socialism as their national programme is for us an immense source of strength.

Our Party maintains that patriotism is inseparable from proletarian internationalism, at these two noble ideas are two aspects of fidelity to socialism. In present-day nditions we consider the following to be the main criteria of proletarian ternationalism: co-ordination of national and international interests; promotion of ity; friendly mutual assistance and comradely co-operation; formulation of collective sitions and actions on major political issues, but on the basis of independence, equality d voluntary co-operation of fraternal parties. The recent experience of the international ommunist movement, the Berlin Conference of European Communist and Workers' rties, have highlighted the special importance of systematic bilateral and multilateral changes of views, continued joint development of Marxist-Leninist theory, upon which r movement rests, ideological co-operation, and generalisation of experience.

The study, assimilation and correct application of the experience of the international ommunist and Workers' movement is, we believe, a major element of proletarian ternationalism. At the same time, however, the fraternal parties enrich the ideological nd of Marxism-Leninism by thier own experience of struggle and activity.

Alongside its own experience, the HSWP, now as always, attaches great importance to e experience of the international working-class movement and of the fraternal parties. r Party continues to learn from all the Communist parties and all the revolutionary rces. And of especial importance for us is the vast theoretical and practical experience of e Communist Party of the Soviet Union founded by Lenin, and the development of the rld's first socialist state, which blazed the trial into the future. The world's volutionary forces have always drawn on the inexhaustible treasure-store of the historic perience of the Soviet Union, which this year will be celebrating the 60th anniversary of viet power. And this will be so in future, too.

Drawing on the experience of others is not the same as mechanical copying and does not pair a party's independence. For each Party is responsible for what experience it draws and how it uses it. Our own Party makes a point of applying the commonly-valid ctrine of Marxism-Leninism with full account to Hungary's historical, political, onomic and other peculiarities. This is expressive of the fact that ours is, at one and the me time, a patriotic and internationalist Party.

The Party

It is a fundamental proposition of Marxism-Leninism that the working-class party ays the decisive role in directing the socialist revolution. The party is the Marxist-ninist revolutionary vanguard of the working class, its supreme political organisation

representing and implementing the interests of the entire working class and the people.

In all its activities the HSWP is guided by the theory of Marxism-Leninism and Leninist norms of Party life. The HSWP is the recognised leading force of Hungarian society and this is formalised in the Constitution. Today, our Party is directing the building of a developed socialist society.

Our experience has taught us the vast importance of a correct interpretation of the Party's leading role. *In the past there have been mechanical interpretations, according* to which the Party must itself, directly, decide on everything, that it can play its leading role only if it itself undertakes to accomplish practical tasks. Some went on to the extreme: the leading role of the Party can be confined to supervising ideological activity.

Now, however, having drawn the necessary lessons from the past, the Party's leading role is carried out as follows: it takes the initiative, determines the main direction of the country's constructive effort, convinces non-Party people and all the working people of the correctness of its policy, mobilises them to fulfil our plans and controls fulfilment. Party decisions are binding only on the Party and its members. And all Party members in administrative and economic departments and in the mass organisations are responsible to the Party for carrying out these decisions. We do not regard our leading role as privilege, but rather as service to the people, as a duty to formulate the tasks ahead in good time and in conformity with the people's interests. Communists must set an example in every sphere of endeavour.

As a result of historic development and the political unity of the working class, Hungary has a one-party system. The Hungarian Socialist Workers' Party was formed by merger of the Communist and *Social-Democratic parties, a merger that materialised the workers* desire for unity. Our Party thus expresses the interests of a united working class. Its founding about 30 years ago was essential to the winning of working-class power and the building of socialism.

A one-party or multi-party system is not, in our opinion, fundamental to the building of socialism. And there are many examples of socialism being built in countries with more than one party. The decisive factor is militant unity, the political cohesion of the progressive forces committed to socialism.

There is an important conclusion to be drawn from the fact that, though different classes still exist in our society, ours is the only ruling party. This makes it incumbent on us to reckon with and co-ordinate the various interests within the society. Social and political development has led to the elimination of the former exploiter classes, so that today there are only friendly working classes and strata whose basic interests coincide. Nevertheless, beside the overall interests of society, there are different group and personal interests. The Party recognises this and considers it its duty to cater to them, but with priority to the overall interests of society. The social and mass organisations and movements, notably the trade unions, co-operatives and youth organisations, play an important part in expressing these group and personal interests. Systematic exchange of opinions at various levels between representatives of the Party and government and these mass organisations make it possible to take into account and co-ordinate these group and personal interests. That has been our practice for a long time now and it has fully proved its effectiveness.

The Marxist-Leninist revolutionary party is a living, active and developing organism whose aims and structure must always be abreast of the requirements of the times. Our Party has always strictly adhered to the principle of democratic centralism both in its structure and activity. The Party's vanguard role has a different meaning today than in the early period, particularly when it was illegal, operating within a narrow framework and was a party of professional revolutionaries and not, in effect, a mass party. Today, the vanguard role means, on the one hand, uniting all the progressive forces on the various sectors of socialist construction and representing all the classes and strata of society, and, on the other, directing social development.

The influx of new generations of Communists and the new problems that arise in the

...of socialist construction require that the Party improve its style of work, that it always be attuned to the requirements of our age, that Party members steadily improve their Marxist-Leninist training and strengthen their ties with the masses. That was facilitated by the 1975 exchange of Party cards, which strengthened the Party's ideological and political cohesion and unity, and also by the recent Central Committee decision on the Marxist-Leninist training of Party members and the expansion of Party propaganda.

By serving the interests of the broad masses, our Party, the working-class vanguard, extends its mass basis and in this way is increasingly becoming a party of all the working people. That is stressed in our programme statement: "In the continued process of social development, as the distinctions between social classes and strata are narrowed, the Party becomes the Marxist-Leninist vanguard of the entire people."

The Policy of Alliance of all Classes and Strata of the Working People

The leading role of the Party is necessary. But history is made by the people, and socialist society can be established only by the people. The Party, if only because of its numerical size, cannot build socialist society single-handed. The new society is built by all the people, and the building has to be done, under Party leadership, by the joint efforts of Communists and non-Party people, by the people, the masses, the makers of history. The Party and its members can move ahead only together with the people, for the point and purpose of their life is serving the people. Consequently, the results of the Party's work in directing socialist construction depend on its ability to rally the non-Party masses. Without allies, without the masses, victory is inconceivable. Hence, the policy of alliance of all classes and strata of the working people, the constant strengthening of our ties with the masses, is for the Party not a question of tactics, but a political question of the utmost importance.

Alliance policy is a class policy. Above all, it is a policy of alliance of classes based on uninterrupted strengthening of the worker-peasant alliance. Our alliance policy also reflects the cohesion of the 750,000 Hungarian Communists and the millions of non-Party working people. Our experience has shown that close ties with the masses rests on their confidence, which the Party must win again and again. Our 11th Party Congress approved this gratifying statement: "Close ties, unity of Party and people, mutual trust between the Party and the masses, is something we prize above all else. The people know that, under all circumstances, they can rely on our battle-tempered Party, and the Party knows that in the accomplishment of any task it can rely on the people, on the steady growing socialist unity of the nation."

We have learned that we must find allies and appeal to the masses not only in difficult situations, but also when things are going well. Our Party has pursued an alliance policy from its very inception and it has been successful when its ties with the masses were strong. But when these ties, because of a supercilious or unprincipled attitude to our allies, weakened, the Party suffered reverses.

The alliance policy implies, above all, political co-operation based on common interests and aims. A cardinal feature of this policy is that the Party, as the vanguard, must indicate the path ahead, but only if the masses are convinced of its correctness, only if we have won their support, their readiness to follow our lead. In the past there were cases when we advanced too fast, ran ahead and had to turn back to reality and find correct ways and methods. That is what happened with the socialist reorganisation of agriculture, when after several inadequately substantiated attempts we finally solved the problem in 1958-61 by strengthening the worker-peasant alliance, heeding the intentions and interests of the peasant masses and stringently adhering to the voluntary principle.

We must from day to day convince our allies of the correctness of our long-range aims and in this way broaden support for our cause and our ideas. It is no exaggeration to say that the Hungarian people support our political aims. However, setting a proper development pace of socialist revolution is a political question that always demands very close study. It is practice that convinces our allies of the correctness of our policy. And

there is the proof of experience that the alliance becomes closer when we set correct aim and a correct pace of social progress based on a principled policy hammered out in joint discussion and joint examination with all our allies.

Political co-operation involves people of different philosophical outlook. And we d not depart from Marxism-Leninism for the sake of political co-operation, in whic principled discussion of views and positions, frank consideration of all problems, with du account to common interests, constructive exchange of views, complement each other Our patient, and at the same time, principled policy, has convinced even the Churc leaders of the need to co-operate. Besides, our programme of building socialism expresse the basic interests also of our religious-minded citizens. Both factors contributed to th adjustment of relations between the state and the Church. Favourable conditions for co operation with Hungary's Church leaders were created also by the Patriotic People' Front, which unites our society in building socialism.

The Party's policy is one of socialist unity of the nation. This is the broadest form of ou alliance policy. Its objective and subjective basis is the elimination of antagonistic socia contradictions, so that we now have only friendly labouring classes and strata. Thus, th building of socialism has become a national programme. The very scope of our allianc policy is a measure of our progress. Socialist unity of the nation rests on community o fundamental interests, on the common desire for socialism, progress, peace and nationa prosperity, and on the achievement of these aims through concerted effort. All this foun expression at the recent 6th Congress of the Patriotic People's Front, which approved th 11th Party Congress's policy and its programme of building a developed socialist society.

The Nature of Power and the Role of the State

The fundamental issue of every revolution is that of power. Power is a means o achieving social and economic goals. Its nature is determined primarily by the clas wielding it, by the classes and strata whose interests it expresses and the aims it pursues. History knows numerous forms of assuming and exercising power. The assumption of power by a class and the form in which it exercises its rule always depend on the concret circumstances. This also applies to the working class.

Socialist construction in Hungary is impossible without working-class power. It is a means of achieving our historic goals—winning, defending and building socialism. In Hungary working-class power was embodied in the Soviet Republic in 1919 and in people's democracy in 1947-48. The latter differed substantially from both the dictatorship of the proletariat in Soviet Russia (1917) and the Hungarian Soviet Republic (1919).

All the socialist countries came to socialism through the dictatorship of the proletariat. In tsarist Russia, the working class took power by force of arms and defended it in armed struggle, in the civil war and the fight against foreign intervention. At that early stage of development of the Soviet Union, socialist changes, industrialisation and collectivisation were impossible without forcibly suppressing the resistance of the exploiting classes, the capitalists and landowners. The situation changed with the growing strength of the working class, the consolidation of its rule and the progress of the revolution. This enabled the CPSU to declare that the dictatorship of the proletariat had fulfilled its historical mission and that the state of the dictatorship of the proletariat had become a state of the whole people, with the working class performing its leading role in the period of communist construction.

In the people's democracies the working class came to power in a different situation. The existence of the Soviet Union, its progress, its victory in World War II had created new conditions. In the socialist countries of Europe, the working class won power by relatively peaceful means and from the outset was in a position to follow a broader policy of alliance with other working classes. In Vietnam, China and Cuba, however, the working class had to fight its way to power.

Establishing the dictatorship of the proletariat in Hungary was an historical necessity in

ɔth 1919 and 1947-48. True, the Hungarian working class took power by relatively ɛaceful means in both cases, but in either case it had to defend its power in hard struggle. lass antagonisms assumed an extremely acute form in a society weighed down with urvivals of feudalism. Day after day the first Soviet Republic had to defend itself against oreign armed intervention, and was defeated only by the superior external forces. The langer of enemy attack continued in the decades after 1945, though it tended to diminish, ut in 1956 a counter-revolutionary rebellion broke out, the causes of which are well-nown, and had to be put down in armed struggle.

Our Party is convinced that to ensure internal and external conditions for building ocialism, the HPR needs working-class power and the socialist state and will need them or a long time to come. Just as the thesis about the continuous intensification of the class truggle during socialist construction—a thesis we know from an earlier period—was rong, so it would be a delusion to imagine that the class struggle will steadily abate. This lways depends on the balance of forces at home and in the international arena. The ommunists never seek an intensification of the class struggle, but they must reckon with s likelihood and be prepared to face it, must safeguard the revolution. They must also emember that while detente, peaceful competition between the two social systems and leological struggle are coming to the fore on the world scene, imperialism has by no eans renounced political subversion nor given up attempts to interfere in the affairs of cialist countries.

The functions of the socialist state continuously develop and change in content. The nsolidation of the positions of socialism and the abolition of exploiting classes have luced the activity of the class enemy to a minimum, with the result that the functions of e state as an instrument of suppression have diminished. The main function of the ungarian state today is organisation and management in the economic, cultural and lucational spheres.

Democracy is the essence of socialist power and of the socialist state. It is well-known arxist tenet that the democracy of a system depends basically and invariably on who lds political and economic power, the state apparatus and the means of production, hat classes are allowed to, and really can, participate in managing the affairs of state and ciety, and whether the working people can really share in decision-making and control. nce the socialist state embodies working-class power and serves the interests of all rking people, it is more democratic than any bourgeois democracy. Socialist mocracy is people's democracy in the genuine sense of the term. It is the most nocratic of all systems ever created by mankind.

Socialist democracy gains in breadth and depth as our socialist state develops. The bstantial results achieved in past years provide further opportunities for promoting mocracy, above all in three key spheres of public life: local government, the factories d the co-operatives.

We now attach special importance to the development of democracy in the production here. A basic component of socialist democracy, it enables the working people to articipate effectively in decision-making in their place of work in the solution of other roblems of local or general significance, and help make work more creative. It serves as n important means of shaping socialist relations between superiors and subordinates, akes the working people more aware of their responsibilities and encourages their ctivity.

We also develop democracy by improving the functioning of administrative bodies. The arty does much to perfect them, for clearly defined powers and efficient operation, oupled with a sense of personal responsibility, foster a democratic atmosphere and are fective in combating bureaucracy.

History has borne out the forecast of Marx, Engels and Lenin, who maintained that the ansition from capitalism to socialism would take many different forms although the ibstance would be the same. The Paris Commune (1871), the Great October Socialist evolution and all the people's democracies brought into being after World War II

showed at their very inception features arising from the possibilities and the requirement
of time and place. The existing socialist states, too, are changing as they develop. It is saf
to assume that the socialist revolution will yet give rise to new forms. Power, the state
government, democratic institutions may change in form, but we can not predict thei
concrete forms. It is clear, however, in every country, social relations will underg
qualitative changes when the socialist social system succeeds capitalism.

The form which working-class power has taken in Hungary has proved effective; i
accords with Hungarian conditions, which are distinctive in many respects. Undoubtedly
other solutions may arise in a different set of circumstances. Our further course is clear
"As our society progresses and as class distinctions are effaced and a developed socialis
society comes into being," the 11th HSWP Congress noted, "the state of the dictatorshi
of the proletariat will gradually become a socialist state of the whole people, the workin
class remaining its leading force. In developed socialist society there arise and grow th
elements of communist self-government by the people."

Economic Development

A most important task of the working class after winning power is to set ou
immediately to clear the ground and then lay the economic foundations for the nev
society. Success in building up the economy decides the fate of socialism; it decide
whether socialism can gain the upper hand over the declining capitalist system and brin
people a better and fuller life than capitalism. This depends largely on the standard o
organisation and efficiency on how well economic growth is planned. The 11th Part
Congress emphasised that every sphere of our public life depends on results achieved i
production, through creative effort.

Socialist economic development is based on the people's ownership of the basic mean
of production, which makes it possible to manage the economy according to plan, mak
optimal use of the country's resources, steadily develop the means of production an
relations of production, and continuously improve the standard of living. There ar
different forms of planned economy. In Hungary, basic economic processes ar
determined and controlled by central government bodies, with considerable autonomy a
factory level. Long-range, five year and annual plans play a decisive role. They include an
are complemented by the plans of enterprises, local government bodies and co-operative
Our fourth five-year plan was successfully fulfilled and we are working on the fifth. It wi
carry us a long way towards a developed socialist society.

The figures of our economic progress are impressive. Qualitative changes have occurre
since the country was liberated. In assessing the figures, however, it should be borne i
mind that Hungary has an area of only 93,000 sq. km., a population of 10.5 million an
modest raw material and energy resources. Production capacity has been expanded an
renewed, and now stands at 350 per cent of the last prewar year. Hungary was a backwar
country but in the 30-odd years since its liberation, what was an agrarian-industria
country has become a country with developed large-scale industry and large-scal
farming. It will not be long before it joins the ranks of industrial countries. Compared wit
1938, industrial output has increased tenfold, agricultural output on a smaller area an
with half the work force engaged in the past has grown by more than half and the nationa
income shows a fivefold increase.

The composition of society has changed with changes in the economy. The greater par
of the population is engaged in industry and the working class is the most numerous clas
now. The standard of life is in keeping with our economic level. We have achieved ful
employment, social insurance encompasses all members of society and every citizen i
entitled to free medical care. In rate of housing construction, Hungary is among Europe'
leading countries, though housing conditions are still difficult. One million new flats hav
been provided over the post 15 years.

Against the background of the crises that have shaken the capitalist world in recen
years, the advantages of the socialist planned economy stand out especially clearly. Eve

trying conditions, we made steady economic progress and continued to raise, if on a re modest scale, the standard of life. The people regard this, and with good reason, as indication of the solidarity and dependability of our system. We cannot say yet that we re overcome all difficulties. We can and will offset the adverse impact of economic nges in the world, which we will have to reckon with for a long time to come, primarily improving our economic activity, raising its effectiveness, strengthening the CMEA, ending socialist economic integration and promoting economic relations with italist countries on the principle of mutual benefit. We have every reason to look ahead h confidence, for working-class power is solid and our economic progress dynamic and can rely on socialist economic co-operation. In the next 15 to 20 years, Hungary will ld the material and technical basis for developed socialist society and become an nomically developed country.

Cultural Development

For a long time to come, an important function of the socialist state will be to organise l promote culture and education. Cultivating socialist consciousness and raising tural standards are both a major factor in economic growth and the main prerequisite the development of the individual and stimulating his public activity. An important ective of our socialist system is to further the people's cultural development and ninate distinctions in cultural standards.

Marxist-Leninist ideology and ideological education play a decisive part in every sphere our public life. The Party does much to ensure that the dissemination of Marxist-ninist ideas holds an important place in all party activity. A thorough knowledge and ative application of the new conclusions of Marxist-Leninist theory and the social ences, it emphasises, are the main source, and at the same time an earnest, of the Party's cessful guidance of socialist construction. Interest in the ideas of scientific socialism is n in the fact that lately an annual average of over 2,200,000 people have been studying rxism-Leninism. The spread of Marxist-Leninist ideas raises the ideological level of iety and, in addition to our political unity, strengthens the ideological unity of society.

Socialism and science are natural allies. Our state makes a special effort to develop ucation, vocational training and science in step with the growing social requirements. A gain of our socialist society is the introduction of compulsory eight-year education and fact that most school-leavers can continue their studies. Our realistic goal now is iversal secondary education, and that the choice of profession is not substantially luenced by economic circumstances. In secondary education, the focus is on training of lled workers. Some 25,000 young specialists are graduated from our higher institutions ery year, and they are fully confident of their future. Three per cent of the national ome is appropriated for scientific research and development—an amount that can tly be regarded as satisfactory by international standards.

Our state encourages the free development of socialist culture, the arts and letters. ere are ample opportunities for creative endeavour and experimenting. The results ieved in the cultural field are widely known. Our people's state registered a great toric achievement by abolishing the monopoly on education held by the privileged sses. Today there are more persons with a higher education than there were with a ondary education prior to liberation. Every year we publish over 70 million copies of oks or eight times as many as before liberation. The audiences of theatres, concerts and emas and the number of museum visitors have grown many times over. Much of value eing done in culture, education and science. The State Assembly of the HPR recently sed a law on education and culture making it possible for very large sections of the pulation to raise their cultural standards.

Socialist culture encompasses all genuine human values. Our country publishes the sics of world literature in large editions. Specifically, French classics are published in ger editions than in France. There are numerous other examples showing that publicity and exchanges of cultural values—which were endorsed by the Helsinki

Conference—are a common practice in Hungary. Furthermore, we see new opportunitie to expand international co-operation and are willing to explore them. Works servin humanism and progress, values of universal culture, past and present, always find suppo in our country. However, we do not want hostile propaganda to make its way into ou country in the guise of exchanging cultural values, and we do not allow it. This is both right and a duty of the socialist state, whose mission is to attain the greatest ideals of man.

The *programme* statement adopted by the 11th HSWP Congress says that fosterin social consciousness, transforming people's thinking and raising their moral and cultura standards are inseparable from the development of socialist society. We must see to it tha the motto of the finest workers and socialist work teams—"Work, study and live in th socialist way"—becomes a universal social standard. To put it into practice is a important task facing the Party and the socialist state in the spheres of cultural educatio and organisation.

The 11th Party Congress summed up the experience of constructive effort, specified th country's tasks and noted that socialist construction is making good progress and that th principles of Marxism-Leninism and the general laws of building socialism are applie according to our distinctive national conditions. But new problems arise and we seek an find solutions. Our Party considers itself accountable to the people and, in a broade sense, to the international working-class movement. We want our every step and ever action to serve the cause of our people and international progress. Our Party ha persevered in its policy line for twenty years now. We see our paramount task i maintaining and creatively developing a firm general line ruling out all right- and "left" wing distortions. This demands that we should spell out and substantiate our fundamenta principles amd our theory again and again and carry them forward by correctly solving th new problems that crop up in the course of construction.

The programme statement of the 11th HSWP Congress describes building a develope socialist society as our goal. Having laid and strengthened the foundations of the ne society, our country entered the period of building socialism on its own basis. In building developed socialist society, we already discern the outlines of the ultimate historic goal o the Communists and the working class, which is fulfilling its historic mission—th outlines of communism.

Results and Prospects of the Portuguese Revolution

ALVARO CUNHAL

General Secretary, Portuguese Communist Party

THE Eighth Congress of the PCP—our first regular congress since April 25, 1974—hold a special place in Portuguese political life. It analysed the situation in the country and se immediate and long-range tasks for the Party and the people.

The revolutionary process in Portugal remains very complex, zig-zagging, inconsistent Nonetheless, the two and a half years of heroic struggle have won our people truly histori gains and have wrought profound political, economic and social changes. A wide measur of freedom has been introduced. An end has been put to the colonial war, thus opening th road to independence to peoples subjugated by Portuguese colonialism. The workin people have won better conditions. Workers' control was instituted, and many factorie managed by the workers. The monopoly groups have been deprived of their economic an political power. Most of the latifundia have been expropriated and hundreds of collectiv farms organised. Diplomatic, trade, economic and cultural relations have bee established with socialist and Third World countries.

Our people have repelled internal reaction and imperialist pressure and, after nearly alf a century of terrorist dictatorship, have turned the fascist Portugal of yesterday into a emocratic Portugal that has boldly taken the road of socialism.

The Revolutionary Process and the Political Tasks of the Movement

The Portuguese revolution has confirmed the existence of objective laws of social rogress and of common features of revolutionary development of countries with similar ocio-economic systems and political regimes. It has demonstrated anew the correctness f the Marxist-Leninist propositions on the decisive role of the popular masses in evolutionary transformations, the vanguard mission of the working class, the nevitability of resistance by the ruling classes who have lost their privileges, the class ubstance of political democracy and the importance of the problems of state and overnment. On the other hand—and this, too, is corroborated by Marxism-Leninism nd international experience—a combination of different objective and subjective factors as imparted to the Portuguese revolution many unique features.

The alliance of the popular movement and the Armed Forces Movement (AFM) was he basis of the revolution. It implemented deep-going economic reforms (primarily ationalisation and the agrarian reform) though it did not possess political power, which as shared by constantly quarrelling social and political forces, both in the government nd in the military-political bodies.

These contradictions and complexities were further aggravated by the fact that mocratisation of national life engendered two different processes. At times they would rge, thereby advancing the cause of democracy, at other times they would clash. On the e hand, this was the political development based on the election campaigns conducted a time when large areas of the country were under the sway of reaction and did not enjoy emocratic freedoms. On the other hand, there was the revolutionary movement of the orking class, the popular masses, the army, inspired by the liberation ideals of April 25. he existence of democratic institutions and the important role of elections cannot bscure the fact that the activity of the government and the solution of concrete problems ffecting the people's interests were strongly and constantly influenced by the correlation f social, political and military forces.

The very system of power, based on the Constitution now in force, reflects in its ructure and in other aspects both the depth of the revolutionary process and its ontradictions and peculiarities.

Parliament (the Assembly of the Republic) is elected by universal suffrage. The overnment is appointed by the President and is accountable both to him and to arliament. The Revolutionary Council instituted by the military plays an important role n political and military affairs, in line with the importance of the AFM. The President, lected by popular vote, is Commander-in-Chief of the armed forces and Chairman of the Revolutionary Council, thus personifying the country's political development based on lections and the revolutionary movement of the armed forces.

The Constitution also provides that democratic organisations, such as the workers' and esidential-area commissions, play a part in national affairs and exercise control over ndustrial enterprises.

The democratic system formalised by the Constitution facilitates the development of he revolution and the retention of its main gains. The democratic system is characterised y three interconnected features. These are the wide measure of freedoms and rights, the adical democratic transformations (liquidation of the monopolies, workers' control, grarian reform) and the power structure described above.

However, the present regime cannot be regarded as firmly established, for internal eaction, reformist elements, the Social-Democrats and imperialism have not reconciled hemselves to the liquidation of monopoly capitalism and to the socialist course followed y Portuguese democrats.

The reactionaries and the reformists are exploiting all the weak points in the system in

an attempt to annul the gains of the revolution. There is no unitary revolutionary politic power capable of replacing the structures and personnel, still employed in ma departments, of the old fascist machine of government. Though we can hardly speak collusion with the counter-revolutionaries, the government is showing extreme toleran of their activities, including terrorist actions. All this gives reaction many opportuniti for frenzied attacks on the progressive forces, for unremitting attempts to torpe democratic transformations and prepare a violent coup to destroy the young democrac

One might recall the three counter-revolutionary sallies in July and September 1974 ar March 11, 1975. They were foiled by the powerful actions of the popular masses in allian with the AFM. The revolution was thus able to move ahead with broad and quick steps. the AFM had retained its unity, and if the Socialist Party had not openly come out again the revolutionary process, reaction would have been crushed once and for all. The split i the AFM and the Socialist Party's alliance with the reactionaries, an alliance directe against the left forces, precipitated a profound military and political crisis, which o November 25, 1975, culminated in the defeat and breakup of the military left wing.

The reactionaries, now united with one of the AFM groups (the "Group of Nine"), trie to exploit the situation to suppress the workers' movement, steal a march on their alli and capture power. This attack was repelled, but for a long time the position remaine unstable and dangerous.

The counter-revolution is trying to launch a three-prong offensive: plots and terrori acts as preparation for a violent coup; gradual take-over of key posts in the sta apparatus, especially the army; exploiting the anti-democratic situation in many parts c the country in the hope of "winning the elections" and taking over power by "peacef means".

Reaction's immediate goal is to replace the minority Socialist government by a avowedly right-wing government with Socialist participation, abolish the militar political bodies committed to AFM policy (the Revolutionary Council) and thus captu leadership of the armed forces. These plans are helped by the Socialist Party's policy. F like the reactionaries, the Socialist government has, in effect, come out against democratic constitutional regime and is working to destory the revolutionary gain primarily the agrarian reform, workers' control and state participation in the manageme of factories where production is being sabotaged in order to dismantle nationalisatio These anti-constitutional actions of the reactionary and Socialist parties are gainir momentum with every passing day.

To counter reaction, which is trying to provoke instability as the prelude to a counte revolutionary coup, the democratic and progressive forces, as our Eighth Congre emphasised, are working for stability, social order and calm. The Communist Party making the biggest effort to consolidate the democratic system and assure norm democratic life within the framework of the existing structures. The fight for respect civil rights and freedoms in every part of the country, the suppression of subversion an above all of the terrorist groups, democratisation of the state apparatus, appointment of democratic government with Communist participation, capable of overcoming th present difficulties and safeguarding democracy on the basis of the revolutionary gair formalised in the Constitution—that is how our Eighth Party Congress formulated th central political task of Portugal's democratic forces.

Democracy and the Road to Socialism

Even under fascism, the PCP declared that the main aims of the anti-fascist revolutio and the condition of its victory was liquidation of the monopoly groups and the latifundi Experience has confirmed the correctness of these aims and the accuracy of the Party' forecasts.

Other political forces, notably the Socialist Party, regarded the anti-fascist revolutio merely as a change of form of government by the dominant classes, with their privilege remaining intact. The Socialists advocated a Western-type bourgeois democracy, with th

ionopolies retaining their economic and political power within the framework of a arliamentary system.

The PCP programme approved by the Sixth Congress (1965) defined fascist overnment as the terrorist dictatorship of the monopolies and latifundia. Accordingly, aving carefully analysed the situation, the PCP declared that the aim in eliminating ascism and establishing a democratic system was not to change the form of government, it to destroy both the political and economic power of the monopolies and latifundists. Portugal the democratisation of political life was and is inseparable from emocratisation of economic and social life.

The overthrow of fascism was soon followed by preparation of a counter-revolutionary oup and widespread economic sabotage.This faced the country with the alternative: ther reaction, big capital and the big proprietors would destroy the young democracy id establish a new dictatorship, or the revolutionary forces would crush the monopoly 'oups and destroy the latifundia to defend democracy.

At the end of 1974 and in the early months of 1975, bankers and capitalists unlawfully ok billions of escudos out of the country and managed to transfer to monopoly iterprises huge sums from the banks. In the factories, reactionary managers thwarted the ilfilment of orders, sharply cut output, depleted funds and posed the threat of mass employment and a standstill in production. Import and export invoices were stematically doctored with the aim of illegally exporting foreign exchange. In the rural uth, where latifundia predominate, the land owners stopped farm work and unlawfully orted livestock or starved it.

Economic sabotage, which had become an important weapon of counter-revolution, s coupled with conspiracies and preparations for a coup. These schemes were foiled by orkers' control in the factories and the vigilance of rural working people. tionalisation and the agrarian reform constituted radical revolutionary changes and ere also needed to save the national economy.

Late 1974 saw powerful actions by urban and rural working people against financial, dustrial and agrarian sabotage; there were emphatic demands for nationalising key dustries. The peasants began to till uncultivated and abandoned lands. The suppression the Spinola coup (March 11, 1975), which was backed by the big capitalists and ndowners, and vigorous action by the masses, which made common cause with the FM in foiling the conspiracy, rapidly advanced the revolution. On March 14, the evolutionary Council announced the nationalisation of banks and declared that an rarian reform was needed.

As we see, the reactionaries tried to reduce the economy to a state of chaos. But the orking people and the revolutionary forces led by the Communists, having ended the imination of monopoly groups and abolished most of the latifundia, prevented onomic dislocation and assured the operation of hundreds of enterprises which their vners had wanted to close down; they occupied and began cultivating abandoned lands id harvested a bumper crop in the agrarian-reform area.

Certain critics accuse the revolutionary forces, primarily the PCP, of having acted erhastily, imposed much too fast a pace on the revolutionary process and thus dangered democracy. What happened was the exact opposite. It was the revolutionary anges effected in the economic structures that made it possible to maintain freedom and mocracy.

There are also those who charge the PCP with taking a stand against freedom and mocracy by rejecting the bourgeois-democratic model of the capitalist countries of estern Europe. That is an absolutely groundless charge. What the PCP is opposed to not democratic freedoms but monopoly power, which persists in countries governed by urgeois-democratic regimes. This is why it insists that there is no room in Portuguese nditions for a West European type of democracy.

Portugal's Communists were the most determined freedom fighters under fascism and main staunch defenders of freedom. Furthermore, they consider the defence of

democratic freedoms to be inseparable as the Eighth Congress re-emphasised, from defence of other gains of the revolution, first of all nationalisation, the agrarian refo and workers' control.

The restitution of capitalist property and the suspension of the agrarian reform (on t plea of promoting a West European type of democracy) would inevitably lead repression, curb and eliminate freedom and install a new dictatorship. Reality speak this only too plainly. The government, which is committed to a policy of restori capitalist and landowner property, has already begun to curb freedom and resort repression. By contrast, the struggle to consolidate the gains of the revolution is itsel struggle to consolidate democratic freedoms and institutions.

The revolution has transformed the country's economic structures.

Nationalisation involves 245 enterprises in banking, insurance, the power industry, refining, metals, chemicals, cement, the paper, glass and tobacco industries, brewi shipbuilding, rail, sea, air and road transport, fishing and other important fields. T assets of the nationalised enterprises add up to 38 per cent of the country's share capit The nationalised enterprises provide 25 per cent of the increase in gross revenue and 44 p cent of the increase in fixed capital and employ 14 per cent of the work force, according tentative estimates.

Also within the range of this vast sector are 261 major enterprises in which sabotage the owners has compelled the state to intervene by putting them under its control, 2 enterprises with government participation and about 800 co-operatives based enterprises abandoned by their reactionary owners. This sector employs about 250,0 workers.

In hundreds of instances, nationalisation, government intervention and the founding co-operatives were ensured largely as a result of *workers' control*. Operating through the commissions, the workers exposed and frustrated the owners' subversive activiti established control over the enterprises and often assumed their management.

The *agrarian reform*, a measure of special importance to the areas, where latifund predominated, began with the peasants' seizure of land. A total of 1,140,800 hectares, about one-fifth of the farmland area, was expropriated and 450 collective productic units (CPU) run by the peasants themselves were set up.

Nationalisation and government intervention virtually eliminated the monopo groups that had all economic power in their hands. The agrarian reform made it possib to transfer most of the latifundia in the South to CPUs.

Some allege that by insisting on these measures, the revolutionary forces, primarily tl PCP, created serious economic difficulties. Reactionaries, reformists and Socia Democrats put about rumours at home and abroad that these reforms spelled disruptio paralysis and chaos in industry and farming. Subsequent developments, howeve exposed these lies.

The fact that many factories and other enterprises neither failed nor closed down is du above all to the struggle and devotion of the workers, who prevented a halt in productio Much more land is cultivated now in the agrarian reform area. Wheat production ha gone up by 60 per cent, oats by 50 and barley by 70 per cent. New crops have bee introduced, the construction of dozens of small dams has helped to expand the irrigate land area and production on stock farms has grown. Due to the agrarian reform unemployment, once chronic, has dropped sharply in areas where latifundi predominated. The proportion of people working on CPUs or in co-operatives i estimated to have increased by 30,000.

As a result of democratic changes, Portugal today has four economic structures: (l non-capitalist (the public sector, nationalised or state-controlled enterprises, cc operatives and CPUs in the agrarian-reform area, co-operatives based on one-time sma and medium-size industrial and commercial enterprises); (2) capitalist (nationa enterprises, mostly in light industry, and foreign companies); (3) the small-commodit production sector (small farms and factories, and handicraftsmen); (4) an economi

ucture tending to transform itself into a state-capitalist sector (enterprises with vernment participation).

On analysing today's economic set-up and the share of the structures listed above, the ghth Congress came to the conclusion that considerable sectors of the national economy longer come under capitalist laws. The economy is going through a period of transition om the capitalist to the socialist type. The capitalist type of economy predominates but a n-capitalist type is beginning to play a decisive part. The Congress stressed that the sence of revolutionary power threatens the loss of what has been achieved.

This means that the policy of restoring capitalist and land-owner property on which action insists and which the Socialist government is virtually pursuing conflicts with the onomic development laws of present-day structures. Only a policy geared to nsolidating the gains of the revolution and to a socialist perspective can solve today's allenging economic and financial problems and foster the progress of the country. xperience shows that the economy can be revived and advanced only if account is taken the working peoople's will, labour elan, initiative and revolutionary spirit and if the ins of the revolution are consolidated.

The economic policy should reckon with the existence of diverse structures and with the centives and dynamics of their development. It must provide conditions for the growth the capitalist sector. However, the orientation should be on dynamically developing a n-capitalist structure on the basis of nationalised enterprises, workers' control and the Us and co-operatives.

o nullify the gains of the revolution and restitute capitalist and landowner property uld mean putting an early end to democracy and imposing a new dictatorship. In view he revolutionary changes carried out to date, the road to preserving and promoting edom and democracy is not a capitalist but a socialist road.

The Socialist Government and the Democratic Alternative

Less than a year has passed since the new Constitution was adopted, that is, since the mocratic system was legalised, yet Portuguese democracy is in serious danger again.

The economic and financial situation is particularly alarming. The trade and balance of yments deficit is growing. The 1976 figures are likely to amount to 66,000m. and ,000m. escudos respectively. This means that gold and foreign exchange reserves will be hausted before long. Yet the government solicits more and more new foreign loans, king the economy increasingly dependent on imperialism.

Domestic reaction tries, in collusion with imperialism, to drain the country of its oney reserves and upset food supply so as to enable the "benefactors" who offer financial id" to impose on Portugal draconic political conditions and pave the way for the olition of democracy and the formation of a reactionary government.

The deterioration of the financial situation expected in the near future demands prompt tion.

The Socialist minority government is becoming less and less popular. It cannot solve the untry's urgent problems by resorting to Social-Democratic demagoguery, on the one nd, and restoring capitalist and landowner property, on the other. Its anti-labour and ti-popular policy, which puts the whole burden of economic difficulties on the working ople's shoulders and leads to greater exploitation, cannot bring about the requisite onomic upturn and financial stabilisation.

The Eighth Congress pointed out that the country's difficulties can be overcome only by obilising untapped resources, the people's effort, will and energy and by drawing on eir patriotic enthusiasm.

This, in turn, can only be done by consolidating the gains of the revolution and firmly rsuing a policy of non-capitalist development.

The inability of the present government to cope with its problems has compelled the litical forces of the nation to concern themselves with the issue of an alternative.

While continuing preparations for a coup, the reactionary forces are also working

feverishly to replace the one-party Socialist government with an undisguised right-wi cabinet which would include the Socialist Party (SP), the People's Democratic Par (PDP) and the Social Democratic Centre (SDC).[1] Such a government would work return property to the capitalists and to stop the agrarian reform. The Eighth PC Congress stated clearly that, as regards national interests, such a policy would be ev worse than that of the Socialist government. It would no only cause greater econom depression, but would also endanger the democratic system.

The Congress pointed to the necessity and possibility of a democratic alternative a proposed two possible solutions: either a *left-wing government* supported by a majority the Republic's Assembly (i.e., by the SP and PCP), or a *government with a non-par leader* (civilian or military) to include the military and civilians, members of parties a independents, but supported by the Socialist and Communist parties. In either case t new government must lean on a programme approved by the President and t Revolutionary Council.

Obviously, conditions for the formation of a democratic government which wou include the PCP will arise only after the SP leadership has abandoned its anti-labour a anti-popular course and its alliance with the right. The 107 Socialist and 40 Communi deputies in the Assembly form a majority (121 deputies represent the SDC and PDP). T Socialist Party leadership, opposing co-operation with the Communist Party, responsible for the fact that so far no democratic solution has been found. Faced wi differences in their own party, they exclude anyone holding leftist views from the nation leadership. Several decrees and resolutions have been issued by the government latel spearheaded against the working people's interests and against the agrarian reform.

Notwithstanding all this, the Communist Party is campaigning untiringly for Socialis Communist unity because on this depends the future of democracy in Portugal. We are f closer unity of the working-class and trade union movement, for their cohesion whic reaction and the SP leadership would destroy. We are for strengthening the organisatio and movements of small and middle farmers and other intermediate strata. We are for a alliance between the people and the armed forces because, although the situation h changed, democracy depends largely on the strength of this alliance.

The struggle for democratic unity is being waged at the "top" (at the level of governin bodies) and at grassroots level, among the masses. The PCP is striving to co-operate wit the Socialists in Parliament, with the President of the Republic and with th Revolutionary Council. In the Assembly the Communist Party is working for mutu understanding with the Socialists on specific issues, as was the case during the debate o the municipal election law, or when the Communists and Socialists, voting togethe defeated a bill tabled by reaction through the SDC.

At the same time, the Communist Party is working to organise the masses and the activities in defence of freedoms and other revolutionary gains and to stabilise th democratic system.

At this writing, Portugal is preparing for municipal elections. The concrete compositio of the local government bodies will be very important, but the December 12 elections w have even greater political consequences. If the reactionary parties (SDC and PDP taking advantage of the situation in the big areas under their control that have not yet bee touched by democracy, are able to win the support of a large number of Socialists, this wi undoubtedly strengthen their positions and they will demand a share in the government. the "United People" candidates, representing the Communist Party and certain non-part democratic circles, win as many or more votes as were cast for the PCP candidates durin the April 1976 elections to the Republic's Assembly (mainly in the industrial regions an the agrarian-reform area), this will greatly help to defend and consolidate th revolutionary gains and cause a leftward shift among a large section of the Socialist Part and the circles influenced by it.

The trade union congress at the end of January will be an important event. Manoeuvr against working-class unity are part of the policy employed by reaction with th

onnivance of the SP leaders. A split in the trade union movement would weaken the orking people's opposition to the plans to return the property of the capitalists and ndowners and should undermine the strength of the organised contingents of working eople who are strongly in favour of a socialist course for Portuguese democracy.

Reaction and the SP are attacking the united trade union centre Intersindical through a ampaign of slander and intrigue, trying to portray it as a "PCP tool". Supported by veral trade unions, their plans are either to impose their hegemony on the trade union ovement, or to split it. But every day they are losing support. Some trade union leaders, ho opposed Intersindical, have been forced by public pressure to change their positions. he mass movement for unity is making rapid headway. The most representative trade nion meeting in Portugal's history was held on October 22 with 222 unions attending (of ese 160 are branches of Intersindical) with a membership of 1,585,000. On November 6 a eeting was held of 621 trade union leaders representing 156 unions, 3,155 trade union elegates, and 1,377 delegates from commissions representing 711,860 workers at 2,016 nterprises. The working people are determined to protect trade union unity from being plit by reaction and the Social-Democrats with the support of imperialism.

The workers' and popular movement, well organised, with a high level of political wareness and an outstanding fighting capacity, played a deciding role in winning and efending freedoms and in carrying out revolutionary economic reforms. And today, it is ass action that can defeat the reactionary forces, frustrate their plans to return property the capitalists, landowners and imperialists, defend the revolutionary gains and ensure mocratic advance along the socialist path.

The Party of Truth, Hope and the Future

During the days of fascism the PCP was the main force of resistance. It made the biggest ntribution to defending freedom and to the revolutionary transformations that llowed the overthrow of the fascist dictatorship. A tried and tested vanguard of the orking class and of all toiling people, well organised and closely bound up with the ople, the PCP plays a special role in the present revolutionary process.

Without the working people or against their interests democracy can neither be efended nor strengthened. To repulse reactionary sallies and solve the country's urgent oblems, the working people and their Communist Party must participate energetically the nation's affairs at all levels, including the government level. The PCP's struggle to fend and strengthen democracy acquires exceptional importance today. The Eighth ongress stated there can be no democratic solution of the existing problems without the CP, still less against it.

The Eighth Congress demonstrated anew the role of the PCP in a democratic Portugal, showed the Party to be well organised, with a high level of political consciousness and volutionary spirit of its members, it demonstrated their solidarity and deep ties with the orking class and people. The congress made it clear that the Communists are ready to ve all their strength and creative energy to solving the problems facing the working ople for the sake of national interests and for a democratic society.

The congress delegates represented 115,000 Party members and 7,000 branches, 3,000 them at enterprises. Of the total Party membership, 59 per cent are workers, 20 per cent nployees and 6 per cent professionals. Fifteen thousand members (13 per cent) are farm orkers. Thirty-five per cent of the membership are under 30 years of age, 47 per cent are om 30 to 50 years old and over 5,000 are under 20. The Communist youth organisations[3] ve a membership of 25,000. The number of women in the Party is relatively small (17 per nt).

The congress heard a report on the Party's intensive information and propaganda work. uring the election campaigns 10 meetings and 80 get-togethers were held daily to discuss d explain the main issues. Posters, slogans and manifestoes were published in millions copies. During the first nine months of 1976 the average edition of the Communist arty newspaper *Avante!* was 99,871 copies. Since April 25, 1974, we published 139 books

and pamphlets in a total edition of 2,174,430 copies, which is about 15,643 copies for eac publication.

The Eighth Congress was preceded by intensive preparations conducted in conditio of complete democracy. The Central Committee theses were available for discussion month before the congress and the Central Committee report a week before.

Over 2,300 special meetings were held, attended by close to 50,000 Party members t discuss the theses and elect delegates to the congress. At these discussions Part organisations and members made 3,149 suggestions, of which 1,366 were incorporated i the congress's Political Resolution.

The Eighth Congress analysed the development of the revolutionary process i Portugal and outlined the tasks in building a democratic society with a sociali perspective.

The new Cental Committee elected by the congress included all the 36 members an alternate members of the previous Central Committee, and 54 new members. There are 4 workers and 22 employees in the new Central Committee. Twenty-four members a under 30 years of age and 53 are under 40.

From four to six thousand members and non-members of the Party attended eac session, the total adding up to approximately 40,000. The congress was also attended b 63 foreign delegations and numerous delegations from Portuguese political partie including the Socialist Party, Intersindical and trade union associations, small and middl farmers' organisations, and others.

The Eighth Congress was a vivid demonstration of the PCP's internationalist an deeply national policy. Because of the identity of working-class interests in all countrie we hold that the internationalist and national obligations of workers' parties a inseparable. Proletarian internationalism, far from ruling out, presupposes resolu defence of the interests of one's own people and country, the defence of national interest The PCP's firm internationalist position and the internationalist feelings of its membe were characteristic of the Eighth Congress and were also seen in the warm and sincer reception accorded the delegations from fraternal parties and national-liberatio revolutionary movements.

The rally in Lisbon on the closing day of the congress attended by tens of thousands wa particularly impressive. It was addressed by representatives of the PCP, the CPSU Vietnam, FRELIMO and the MPLA. The inviolable fraternal friendship and solidarit with the Soviet Union, with the peoples who had freed themselves of Portugue colonialism vividly symbolised the PCP's consistently internationalist policy. The Eight Congress demonstrated that the Portuguese Communists are true to their people and t their country.

The congress set this central goal—upholding the working people's interest strengthening the democratic system, opposing foreign interference, defending th interests of a free, democratic and independent Portugal. Strengthening Portugues democracy is inseparable from consolidation of revolutionary gains and an independen national policy. Democracy, socialism and national independence are indivisibl conceptions and goals.

The political and economic situation in Portugal is very complex. There are many sign that the revolution is again in danger. The Eighth Congress warned of this danger an showed what should be done against it.

The PCP is firmly supported by the working class and all working people. Its policy i finding an ever deeper response among them. By its struggle against domestic and extern enemies, by overcoming difficulties and obstacles, by placing itself at the service of th people and the country, the PCP is asserting itself in the revolutionary process as a part of truth, hope and the future.

Portugal's Communists will share no efforts to live up to the hopes placed on them.

[1] Two right-wing political organisations. In October 1976 the People's Democratic became th Social-Democratic Party.—*Ed.*

[2] Young Communist League and Union of Communist Students—*Ed.*

Time of Big and Realistic Hopes

MAX REIMANN
Member of the Executive Presidium, German Communist Party

S an idea, a utopia, a dream of a brighter future, socialism has existed for centuries. Its ography as a scientific vision of the world's future is much shorter: 128 years ago the *ommunist Manifesto* proclaimed the objective necessity of socialism's appearance in the orld arena. Measured in terms of history, as a reality, an existing social system that is veloping and winning new positions, it is very young indeed: this year the Soviet people ll be joined by people throughout the world in celebrating the 60th anniversary of the st socialist revolution and proclamation of the world's first socialist state. But millions roughout the world now associate their aspirations and hopes with scientific and isting socialism.

Why? First, because with every passing year there is brought to the fore and vividly monstrated to the masses the humane aims, plans and practical deeds of the mmunists—those who were victorious in October 1917 and have been consolidating t victory, and those who since the October Revolution led the working people of their ntries to power and the building of socialism, and those who are continuing the ggle against capitalist exploitation and oppression.

Much has been written about the significance of October as the watershed between two orical eras, as the beginning of a new historical period marked by the collapse of erialism and the assertion of socialism. Marxists-Leninists have every right to claim t the Great October Socialist Revolution, though a revolution of the working people of old, tsarist Russia, was a supreme gain of the international proletariat, the triumph of oletarian internationalism. For us proletarian internationalism means solidarity and ity of the working-class forces of different countries, and also of those who firmly pport its positions and are working towards a definite goal—the refashioning of society ong socialist lines. Now as always, we differentiate this from the international solidarity broad sections of the population for the attainment of aims of a general democratic aracter: peace, security, social progress, i.e., aims which, in particular, were discussed at e Berlin Conference of European Communist and Workers' Parties.

The October Revolution brought to reality the forecasts of the founders of scientific cialism and was the first big step in attaining the common ideals of the international orking class, reaffirming the reality of the aim of international unity of the workers, the ry substance and meaning of internationalism. It has laid its imprint on the entire volutionary process, giving it a new quality which I would define as the strengthening of e Communists' historical optimism. At the same time, the October Revolution came as e embodiment of the bold visions of all the thinkers of the past who dreamt of a social stem founded on the ideals of humanism, happiness and justice. That explains why it has et with world-wide support among the peoples, among all progressive and honest-inded men and women.

It is the humanism of socialism and the ideas of October that I wish to reflect upon in is article.

I belong to the generation that went through the First World War, the uncompleted 18 revolution in Germany, the Weimar Republic, fascism and the Second World War, e defeat of Hitler Germany by the anti-Hitler coalition, the revival, incontravention of e coalition's Potsdam agreements, of monopoly capital in the FRG, Germany's rtition by the West German and US imperialists, and the emergence of the socialist erman Democratic Republic. Together with Karl Liebknecht and Rosa Luxemburg generation of German revolutionaries hailed the victory of the Russian workers and asants in October 1917. We were trained, and trained the younger generation, in the

spirit of Ernst Thaelmann's behest that the criterion of a Communist's genuine devotion to the revolution is his attitude to the Soviet Union. Today, too, the FRG Communists maintain close ties of solidarity with the land of Lenin and the other countries of the socialist community. And we are convinced that the Soviet Union, which under Bolshevik leadership was the first to embark on the building of a socialist society, has always expressed the fundamental interests of all the peoples, that today, too, it is the cardinal force in the fight against imperialism and the chief guarantor of peace, security and social progress. And we are working for the triumph of socialism also in our country, where the capitalist system is suffocating in a tangle of difficulties and unresolved problems.

The FRG has not escaped aggravation of the general crisis of capitalism. The arms drive, conducted primarily in the interests of the military-industrial complex and the international monopolies, has exacerbated rather than moderated social contradictions. It is now clear that we can hardly expect a substantial decline of unemployment, particularly among the youth, in 1977. The vocational training system has no places for nearly 300,000 youngsters. Deterioration of the educational system continues: schools are overcrowded and yet more and more school-teachers are finding themselves without jobs. And there are these other aspects of the crisis: monopoly attacks on the trade unions, the notorious "ban on radicals", which now affects not only Communists, increasing corruption at the federal, state and municipal level, more crimes and violence and the unsolved monetary, energy and environmental problems.

Regardless of high living standards in individual capitalist countries, the FRG among them, capitalism cannot, by its very nature, eliminate political and economic inequality, poverty, oppression, crises and the workers' fear for the future.

Nor are these problems exclusive to the FRG. The situation is even worse in the leading imperialist power, the United States. This is what Jimmy Carter, long before his election, had to say about social contradictions in the United States: "Too many have had to suffer at the hands of a political and economic elite who have shaped decisions and never had to account for mistakes nor to suffer from injustice. When unemployment prevails, they never stand in line looking for a job. . . . They never do without food or clothing or a place to sleep. . . . An unfair tax structure is designed to serve their needs. . . ."[1]

The capitalist world is rich enough to squander billions of dollars, marks, pounds, francs, etc., on armaments, on developing and producing new weapons of mass annihilation, and yet it cannot permit itself humanism, even to the extent of reducing unemployment, appropriating more for public health, culture, the social services, schools and housing. Only socialism, its home and foreign policy expressed in the terse formula: "everything for the sake of man, for the benefit of man", guarantees the people what is most important—work, health care, education, social confidence, political rights and freedoms, peace and security.

Sixty years ago the Russian Bolsheviks proclaimed:

—power to the Soviets!

—the mills and factories to the workers!

—the land to the peasants!

—peace to the peoples!

It was with these slogans that the Bolsheviks began building the most humane social system known to history, a system free of exploitation, crisis, unemployment, poverty, national, racial and political inequality, militarist psychosis and fear for the future. And this system, the socialist world system, is advancing from strength to strength and is reaching out to new frontiers.

The building of socialism and communism is proceeding successfully. That was recorded by the 25th CPSU Congress and by the congresses of the ruling Communist and Workers' parties in a number of socialist countries. In 1976, too, the family of socialist states continued to gather strength. The reunification of Vietnam was completed and the country is now a socialist republic. In Laos, following the victory of the patriotic forces and the coming to power of the Marxist-Leninist People's Revolutionary Party, the

eople, now that power is in their hands, have launched out on building the new life.

Fresh victories have been scored by the national-liberation movement. The road to ndependent development was opened to Democratic Kampuchea. Angola's patriots efeated imperialist intervention and internal reaction.

The ideas of Marx, Engels and Lenin are spreading throughout the world. Communist arties in a number of capitalist countries have made impressive headway: they have ncreased their membership, strengthened their mass base, enhanced their authority and olitical weight. The masses, and notably the youth, in the capitalist countries, the FRG ncluded, show a growing interest in and support for socialism. In fact, this can no longer e ignored by the propagandists of the big business parties. In an attempt to counter the ounting influence of the ideas of socialism and peace and justify the arms drive, which erves the interests of the monopolies, they are stepping up their attacks on detente, preading the lie about a "growing military menace" from the socialist countries, onducting a slanderous campaign against the GDR and are trying to create a democratic alo around imperialist society, at the same time vilifying the socialist system (witness the emagogic Christian-Democrats' "freedom or socialism" slogan in the last FRG ections).

Furthermore, on the plea of "defending the free world", "freedom", "democracy", Western civilisation", etc., (fine words to camouflage the avarice of monopoly capital) ey appeal to the masses to "tighten their belts", "cut down on consumption", abandon fight for higher wages, more low-rent housing, better schools, better transport rvices, defence and expansion of the people's democratic gains, their rights and edoms, and for social progress.

But these appeals are meeting with a diminishing response. For more and more people e coming to realise that their authors are only emulating the demagogues of whom einrich Heine wrote more than a hundred years ago:

I know the tune, I know the words,
And their authors I well know, too,
In private they sit sipping wine,
Publicly, they preach drinking water.

In contrast, there is a growing response to the example set by existing socialism, which or the first time in history has not only proclaimed civil rights and freedoms, but has also rovided the conditions for their exercise.

Socialism brings the peoples peace and security. The word "peace" was enshrinked on ocialism's banners from the very birth of the new society, and this immensely accentuated e humanism of October. Lenin's speech at the Second Congress of Soviets and the ecree on Peace contained, in basic outline, the principles of peaceful coexistence of tates with different social systems. Socialism's policy has consistently been guided by ese principles, and it is not the fault of the Soviet Union that this policy has not always ttained its aims.

I well remember how, in December 1933, after the nazis had come to power in Germany, e CPSU Central Committee invited several states to join in a collective security system s a defence against aggression. If this system were formed, the peoples would have been pared all the horrible suffering and calamities of the Second World War. But the system as not established because of the imperialist powers' anti-Soviet attitude. In those days e forces of socialism and peace were not strong enough to put through a policy that was the vital interests of the peoples.

The situation today is, of course, different. A united front of socialism, the international ommunist and workers' movement, the movement of all progressive, anti-imperialist rces, could impose peace on imperialism. When at the 25th CPSU Congress, which I ttended as representative of my Party, I heard Comrade Brezhnev declare: "Durable eace should become the natural form of life of all European peoples", I recalled the words f Marx: "The working classes are bestriding the scene of history no longer as servile tainers, but as independent actors, conscious of their own responsibility, and able to

command peace where their would-be masters shout war." That was said at a time whe[n] capitalism held undivided sway, and in its drive for profits, new markets and spheres o[f] influence, involved the peoples in wars in order to exploit other peoples. But even in thos[e] conditions, in his article "Can Europe Disarm?" Engels came out against the unrestraine[d] arms race and called on the peoples to fight for disarmament. For he was convinced tha[t] "disarmament and thus guarantee of peace are possible". With what greater optimism ca[n] we approach the problem in today's fundamentally changed world!

For today, thanks to the unflagging efforts of the USSR, other socialist countries an[d] all the peace forces, it has already been possible to ward off the menace of nuclear war making peace more reliable and durable. Important international agreements have bee[n] concluded: the ban on nuclear-weapon tests in the three environments, th[e] non-proliferation treaty, limitation of Soviet and US strategic weapons, the ban o[n] stationing nuclear weapons in outer space and on the sea-bed, the prohibition an[d] destruction of bacteriological weapons. These achievements are proof that disarmamen[t] is not a "Communist fantasy", but a very real reality. However, all that has bee[n] accomplished to date must be consolidated and carried further. This is a difficult task and one that brooks no delay, for the successes of socialism inspire fear, even fury, in th[e] imperialist camp. Compelled to adapt itself to the new conditions and accept peaceful coexistence, imperialism, by its very reactionary nature, continues to cast a siniste[r] shadow over the radiant hopes of mankind. Imperialism's aggressive proclivities are still there, though it employs modified forms and methods.

And there is ample proof of that: the blood shed in South Africa and the Lebanon; th[e] Rhodesian racialists' piratic attacks on Mozambique, condoned and encouraged by th[e] capitalist powers; the bombs put in planes of socialist countries, etc. The aggressiv[e] faction is reacting to its defeat in class struggles, the loss of colonies, the withdrawal of more and more countries from the capitalist system and the growing influence of th[e] Communist parties, by boosting the arms drive, building more war bases, inducing a militarist psychosis. What the imperialists want is to revive the "positions of strength" policy and dictate to other countries and peoples.

As a West German Communist, I cannot but feel alarmed over one of the last acts of the outgoing US Republican administration: its decision substantially to increase this year the number of aircraft in Western Europe, which will mean more US servicemen in some European countries. The F-15 Eagle fighter planes will now appear at US bases in the FRG. The Pentagon has publicised that fact, adding that it will give NATO a "superior capability" over the Warsaw Pact. More, the Pentagon is using truculent language in an attempt to intimidate the socialist community. That this stands no chance of success is now becoming obvious to realistically-minded representatives of the capitalist world. A more sober view of the situation is gaining ground. It is based on the changed balance of world forces, though the deteriorating economic situation in most imperialist countries plays no small part, too.

As a soldier in World War I, Lenin's call for peace made an indelible impression upon me. It found an answering chord both among us German soldiers and the French across the battle line.

Lenin described disarmament as the "ideal of socialism". Today we must do everything for the Soviet humane appeal, which accords with the aspirations of the whole of mankind, to reduce armaments and achieve disarmament, the steps towards that goal set out in the CPSU 25th Congress Programme of Further Struggle for Peace, the concrete initiatives of the USSR and other socialist countries, the road to peace and disarmament outlined in the final document of the Berlin Conference of European Communist and Workers' Parties, to acquire the same magnetic attraction as the slogan of peaceful coexistence and become a reality of international life.

The position of the German Communist Party on this issue is absolutely clear. Together with other democratic and peace forces of the Federal Republic, it is combating the policy of state-monopoly capital, which is inimical to our people's interests and to European and

rld peace. "International developments," our Bonn Party Congress emphasised, nfirm what we Communists have been advocating with the utmost resolve—a policy igned to serve the national interests of the FRG and the cause of peace cannot be plemented without account to the main trends of our time. The national interests of our intry and the peace interests of its people require that the FRG actively participate in ending detente, reject any moves of a neo-colonialist character and unilateral links with EEC and NATO, reject all attempts to set up a nuclear-armed 'European defence nmunity'. The national interests of the FRG and the peace interests of our people uire, above all, continued improvement of relations with the Soviet Union, the GDR l the socialist community, which now increasingly determines the main direction of ernational development." Our Party believes that the Federal Republic must make a istructive contribution to armaments restriction and disarmament. And we have gested a realistic beginning: a 15 per cent reduction in military expenditure. However, battle for disarmament has lost none of its sharpness. For not only the monopoly ups and the military-industrial complex, but also some Social-Democratic politicians efence Minister Leber, for one) are boosting military spending, tying the FRG still ser to NATO and keeping alive reactionary chauvinism in the Bundeswehr.

Our fight against this policy is supported by many rank-and-file Social-Democrats and de unionists, for they know that every step towards disarmament is a step towards ente and security and will, moreover, release considerable means for the solution of ssing social problems.

The GCP welcomes the Warsaw Treaty Nations' Appeal to all other signatories of the lsinki Final Act to pledge not to be the first to use nuclear weapons against each other. is initiative accords with the national interests of all European countries. It is of special portance for the FRG, where the nuclear-weapon stockpiles are an ever-present danger the population. We urge the FRG government to support the proposal, prevent our intry being turned into a nuclear arsenal, and pursue a constructive policy of detente l disarmament.

Ve consider our disarmament effort to be a duty to our people and our internationalist tribution to the common struggle of Communists and all progressive and democratic es for peace, security and social progress. To this I would add that the humanism of ialism's slogans of detente, disarmament and peaceful coexistence does not run nter to the general development laws of the revolution discovered by Marx, Engels and in and confirmed in practice. Detente and peaceful coexistence come within the realm tate-to-state relations, they include acceptance of the territorial status quo and are ed at precluding the possibility of military conflicts, fraught with a menace to the very tence of mankind. But neither detente nor peaceful coexistence should be equated 1 retention of the social status quo. The class struggle, the struggle for social and onal liberation and against oppression, is the inalienable right of the working people the exploited of every country. And to win in this struggle against the international e of capital there must be, as Lenin taught us, an international alliance, an rnational brotherhood, of the workers. Hence, international co-operation in the fight peace, conducted on a broad democratic basis, is not a substitute for proletarian rnationalism which, in our view, is the central objective factor essential not only to ente, disarmament and peaceful coexistence, but also to the entire anti-imperialist, -monopoly and anti-capitalist struggle for mankind's freedom and happiness. The man Communist Party considers solidarity in this struggle its internationalist duty.

is right to say, I think, that the Communists are entering the new year, 1977, with ad plans and clear aims, with a concrete and mass-supported programme of action for e, security and social progress. Future historians will be justified in describing our s as times of great hope. For mankind is decisively turning from war to peace, from rnational tension to detente and peaceful coexistence. The continuous change in the nce of forces in favour of socialism, the upsurge of the working-class and national- ation movements, have made it impossible for the imperialist powers to impose their

will on the peoples.* The last links of colonial fetters are being destroyed. And yet only few decades ago imperialism kept three-quarters of the world's population in fetters. Th prospect is becoming increasingly realistic of closer economic and cultural co-operatio between countries and peoples on such vital matters as the fight against hunger, povert epidemics, protection and improvement of the environment, etc.

For one who has been in the ranks of the workers' revolutionary movement for decade it is gratifying to know that the ideas of socialism, freedom and peace are hewing a way fo themselves in my country and throughout the world. Millions of men and wome associate their hopes for peace, security, freedom, democracy and the happiness of the children and grandchildren with socialism—the real, existing and developing socialis that has been in power now for nearly 60 years—and with socialism as an aim of struggl as the image of tomorrow's world. For these millions October and socialism ar indivisible. And can one really imagine socialism today without the USSR, and th Communist movement without the CPSU? In the hearts of millions of labouring peopl and in international politics these concepts have been inseparable now for nearly si decades, and this inseparable tie gains strength with every passing year.

[1] *International Herald-Tribune*, July 19, 1976.

Alternative to Monopoly Policy

WILLIAM KASHTAN
General Secretary, Communist Party of Canada

THE capitalist world has entered a period marked by growing instability and continue crisis in the economic, political and ideological fields. Recovery, such as it is, has brough no significant declines in either unemployment or inflation. Both have become permanen features of capitalism. This is borne out by developments in Canada. Over the past thre years consumer prices increased 32.2 per cent. Food prices rose 50.4 per cent, higher tha the total food price increase of the past 20 years. Unemployment has been growin throughout most of the postwar period. In 1975 it stood at 800,000. Unemploymen particularly affects young people, but also women workers, skilled and unskilled worker blue and white collar workers. Some provinces are harder hit than others. Newfoundlan for instance, unemployment is as high as 18, even 20 per cent, while in the Maritim provinces it averaged 11.6 per cent in 1975.

The government's anti-inflation programme has led to a wage restraint and undermine collective bargaining and the right to strike, without curbing prices or profits. This ha been combined with attacks by provincial governments on health, education and socia legislation, and with a substantial tax increase, all in the "interests of combatin inflation".

The widely held illusions that the so-called anti-inflation programme would set thing right have been dispelled. Over the past three years wages and salaries rose 32 per cent while the cost of living rose 34.6 per cent. Corporate profits, before taxes, rose 111 pe cent. The monopolies are appropriating an increasing share of the country's wealth at th expense of its working people.

The crisis of the Canadian economy has hit farmers as well as workers. The agricultura crisis, with its market upheavals, price instability and supply problems, is a source o further impoverishment and growing insecurity for many farmers.

The Trudeau government's anti-inflation programme is doomed to failure. It is no

ssible to control the economy without controlling the multi-national corporations in
nada. Only democratic control over the multi-nationals and monopoly, over prices and
ofits, can curb inflation and unemployment. But the reactionary forces are opposed to
y such control. By equating state intervention with what they call "socialism", they want
rally the petty bourgeoisie and middle strata in defence of "free enterprise", and
engthen the right-wing political forces. The latter consider the climate suitable for such
hift to the right, as do also the pro-US forces opposed to even the timid and limited steps
ken by the Trudeau government to Canadianise the economy.

This was the situation in which the 23rd Convention of the Communist Party of Canada
s held last October to work out an effective policy and promote the advance of the
rking-class and democratic movement.

Depression of living standards resulting from growing unemployment, inflation and
acks on wages, has led to a growing working-class fightback. The strike movement has
own in all parts of the country. The labour movement is increasingly taking the
ensive, as seen in the demand for action against monopoly and in the demonstrations of
rliament Hill in Ottawa, in the Quebec Legislature, Montreal and in Manitoba,
katchewan, Alberta, New Brunswick and other parts of Canada.

The workers are strengthening their unity, as evidenced by the stronger bonds among
ons throughout the country and the formation of the Common Front in Quebec. A
nonstration of protest against the government's anti-inflation programme, held in
wa on March 22 last year, was joined for the first time by French-Canadian workers.
 was the starting point of a new unity and solidarity in action between the French-
adian and the English-speaking working class of Canada, proof of the recognition by
 Canadian Labour Congress of the bi-national character of the working class of
nada. It arises as well from the consistent fight waged by the Communist Party for
rking-class unity that has penetrated the thinking and action of the workers.

Growing unity has been buttressed by the growth of the trade union movement and the
rance into it of new sections of workers. This demonstrates anew the ever pressing task
the organisation of the unorganised as a means of further shifting the balance in favour
the working class and creating more favourable conditions for democratic advance.

While the fightback is still limited to economic issues, it tends to take on a more political
aracter. The nature of the struggle is also creating awareness of the nature of the
emy—state-monopoly capitalism. This is noted by the Canadian Labour Congress
en it refers to the alliance of the government and employers. There is a closer link
tween the economic and political struggle, which was evidenced in the strike of Elliot
ke uranium miners who demanded that the government go back on its anti-inflation
easures, the first strike of this kind in Canada. It is to be seen in the 10-point programme
 the CLC which goes beyond collective bargaining and advances an alternative
ogramme to the wage restraining policy of the government.

The National Day of Protest, held in response to the call of the Canadian Labour
ongress, proved nothing short of historic. In dozens of cities workers went on strike in
otest against the policy of the government which had shifted the burden of inflation and
her crisis developments in the Canadian economy onto the working people. At the
eetings and demonstrations that flared up throughout the country they demanded
rogation of the anti-inflation laws, an end to wage restraint and to curbs on strike
tion. The Day of Protest, which had the support of the Communist Party and numerous
ogressive organisations, was the largest action ever launched by the Canadian working-
ass movement.

The growing militancy and consciousness in the working class are seen as well in greater
ternational solidarity and unity of action against the multinational corporations, in
owing friendship and co-operation of Canadian trade unionists with the trade unions of
e USSR, in increased participation of organised labour in the peace struggle, and not
st in the historic decision of the CLC Convention for recognition of May Day as
bour's day. The working class is at the centre of the struggle against monopoly.

The fightback is as yet uneven. Some groups of workers think they can stay out of t fight in the belief that the crisis will not affect them. However, the growing monopo offensive tends to widen the anti-monopoly movement and to bring new sections working people into the struggle.

A central task today, it was said at the Convention, is to unite the struggle against wa restraints with the fight for full employment and against the austerity cutba programme. This is part of the struggle to change government economic and social polic shift politics to the left, strengthen the positions of the working class and democrat forces in federal and provincial parliaments, and curb the power of monopoly and of tl multinationals.

This requires united action of the working class and anti-monopoly forces around democratic alternative to the crisis policies of monopoly. Until the power of tl multinational corporations and of monopoly is broken by an alliance of the working cla and all those democratic, anti-monopoly and patriotic forces that want Canadia independence, until Canadian sovereignty is asserted in all fields, until the basic econom and social rights of Canadians are secured, there will be no progress in our country.

To achieve this programme there will have to be persistent and united efforts on the pa of the working class and democratic forces, the creation of a democratic alliance th includes the Communist Party. It will not be achieved by jumping over stages, by concep of "instant socialism".

A democratic alternative and a new direction for Canada, these are vital tasks toda This was clearly expressed by many delegates at our 23rd Convention. The US imperiali drive on Canada increases day by day. Pressure is mounting to compel agreement b Canada to policies of continentalism and integration, especially the takeover of Canada' natural resources and energy. US imperialism tries to convince Canadians th continentalism is profitable while independence means lower living standards. In theor and practice, continentalism and integration are the road to outright national betrayal fo Canada.

The task today is the adoption of a new made-in-Canada constitution. It must be constitution based on an equal voluntary partnership of the two nations, English- an French-Canadian, which clearly spells out the constitutional rights of the French Canadian nation to self-determination, including the right to secede if her people shoul so decide. The struggle for Canadian independence, for a new made-in-Canad constitution and for national equality for French Canada, and the recognition of the righ to self-determination, are today all linked together.[1]

Independent economic development, a truly Canadian culture with a democrati content, a foreign policy of peace, trade and disarmament, an independent, sovereign an united trade union movement, a new made-in-Canada constitution, all these are element of genuine Canadian independence. The Communist Party of Canada and the Ne Democratic Party have a pivotal role to play in rallying all democratic forces to effect thi programme. And an overcoming of the differences in the approach to a number o political problems would only promote co-operation between these parties. The existin ideological differences should not be a barrier to such united action. However, to achiev united action there must be an end to cold war attitudes and to anti-Sovietism and anti communism in NDP policy. Also an end to the attitude that unity of action is possible onl if the Communists cease being Communists and adopt social-reformist positions. And i our own ranks unity of action requires an end to sectarian tendencies, which deny the nee to seek allies in the struggle against monopoly and reaction.

The policy of the united front and of class alliances is an essential part of the strategy t bring about an anti-monopoly alliance as the pathway to socialism. Our Convention ha again proposed the creation of an anti-monopoly coalition and the formation of democratic government in which the Communist Party would take part. The Communist believe that such a coalition government could open the door to a radical remoulding o society along socialist lines.

This requires first and foremost unity of the working class itself. We try to win the orking class for class struggle policies and for socialism. With this in mind, we work to ercome reformist illusions, help the workers understand the true role of the bourgeois ate, of the mass media and of the right wing in the working-class movement. This is ntral to deepening the class consciousness of the workers.

Working class unity implies full equality for women workers, defence of the interests of ung workers, equal rights for ethnic groups, and abolition of racism and discrimination. These measures must go hand in hand with efforts for an independent, sovereign and ited trade union movement as an indispensable part of the struggle to advance the terests of the working class and the achievement of real Canadian independence.

The Convention documents point out that Communists must work systematically for a orker-farmer alliance on a common programme of action. This will require considerable fort and perseverance. Communists must work in the existing farm movements, rticularly the National Farmers Union, and win support for the Party's policies. Above l, we have to build a strong Communist Party organisation in rural Canada.

Of particular importance are the various democratic movements which have arisen in position to the policies of monopoly. They include the movements in defence of the hts of the Indian, Metis and Innuit people; against racism; for tenants' rights, senior izens' movements; movements for equality for women, in support of training and jobs youth, to defend and improve educational standards; to institute price control; the ce and solidarity movements, and movements for municipal reform.

All these movements, alongside the struggles of the working class, the struggle for nadian independence and for a made-in Canada constitution, are an integral part of a wing anti-monopoly front. Our task is to stimulate, support and participate in these nocratic movements, combining this with a consistent struggle for working-class and nocratic action. As these movements, out of their experience, begin to fight for more lical solutions, conditions will ripen to bring about a democratic, anti-monopoly and ti-imperialist coalition.

Whether this struggle is going to be successful or not depends on how well we use the anging situation to strengthen the bonds between the working class and democratic rces and increase our membership. Since the 22nd Convention, the Party has made adway on a number of fronts. Communists have strengthened their links with the rkers in industry, in trade unions, in neighbourhoods. We can all take pride in the fact it the Party has begun to grow, unevenly as yet, it is true, but it is growing among rkers, young workers, men and women. We can take equal pride in the fact that the ss, particularly the *Canadian Tribune*, although this is equally true of the *Pacific ibune*, *Combat* and the *Young Worker*, is being taken to the factories, the plants, mines d mills on an ever growing scale and is meeting with favourable response wherever this being done. Every week the circulation of the *Canadian Tribune* in terms of distribution reases and has now reached the figure of 30,000. This is a big step forward.

All these efforts have won our Party greater prestige among working people; its opinion being heeded more and more. But our growth should proceed much faster to meet the at new challenges and tasks before us. We continue to lag behind an increasingly ourable situation. It is this which must be corrected if the Party is to live up to its ponsibilities.

We must begin to raise our sights and speak of building a mass Party and a mass culation press. All our work must be related to achieving these central objectives.

The significant changes that have taken place in the world in recent years, it was noted at Convention, have had, and continue to have, considerable impact on Canada and on working class and democratic movement. The main feature of the world situation has n a further shift in the balance of forces in favour of peace, democracy and socialism. In ctice socialism is showing itself to be vastly superior to capitalism in its ability to solve ic problems of society while systematically raising the living standards of its people and ending socialist democracy. The anti-imperialist forces have become ever stronger and

are impelling imperialism to retreat and to recognise the principles of peaceful coexister as the basis of relations between states. However, as Leonid Brezhnev pointed out at t 25th Congress of the CPSU, despite the more favourable international situation, "wo peace is not yet guaranteed." The cold warriors in the capitalist world, centred around t military industrial complex in the USA and in West Gernamy, as well as elsewhe continue their efforts at undermining detente. The arms race continues at an accelerat pace in the USA and NATO. Over $300,000m. is spent annually on the production armaments.

Canada, too, is involved in the arms race. Notwithstanding the sizable increase in ar expenditures in our country, these are still not considered adequate by the Pentagon a the military industrial complex. Continuing and growing pressures are being exerted the Trudeau government to increase these expenditures and to enmesh Canada mo closely in the strategic aims and ambitions of US imperialism, through NORAD a NATO. The struggle to make detente irreversible and to complement political deten with military detente, is today a priority task for the forces of peace, democracy a socialism.

The 25th Congress of the CPSU outlined a series of measures that could consolida peaceful coexistence and advance the fight for peace and disarmament. These inclu proposals for a world treaty on the non-use of force in international relations. T Communist Party of Canada supports this initiative. It also supports the Soviet propos for a World Disarmament Conference, as well as all other steps to detente. In comm with all democrats, we welcome the long-term trade, scientific and cultural agreeme between Canada and the USSR. Such agreements are not only useful for improving t political climate, they create new jobs for many Canadian workers. This illustrates aga why detente, which means peace and jobs, should be actively supported by all Canadi patriotic and democratic forces.

At the same time our Communist Party rejects the imperialist contention that the cl struggle, the struggle for national liberation and the ideological struggle, are at varian with detente. State relations should not be confused with class relations. Detente neith cannot invalidate the laws of capitalism and of exploitation, nor deprive peoples of t right to freedom and independence. The climate of detente and peaceful coexisten profoundly affects social and political developments in the capitalist countries. It creat new and more favourable conditions for the struggle of the working class, for the grow of anti-monopoly movements. Detente has opened new prospects in the fight for soc progress and creates more favourable conditions in the fight for Canadian independence

The struggle for peace was given a powerful impetus by the Berlin Conference Communist and Workers' Parties. Though limited to European parties, it was worldwide significance, first because Europe had been the centre of two world wars in t past, and secondly, because imperialism thought the Communist and Workers' part were so divided they would not meet, or if they did, they would not be able to come agreement.

Our Party welcomes the document of the Berlin Conference which, together with tho adopted by the Conference of the Communist Parties of Latin America and the Caribbe and the Conference of the Communist and Workers' Parties of Arab states, shows that t unity of the Communist movement is growing. We shall continue to work closely with Communist and Workers' parties in fraternal co-operation on the principles of Marxis Leninism and proletarian internationalism.

The role of the international Communist movement is decisive in the struggle f detente, for peace and social progress. Any weakening of the unity of the Communist a Workers' parties hinders that struggle and makes it less effective. This is why imperiali does everything it can to undermine the unity of Communist and Workers' parties. It h stepped up its anti-communist and anti-Soviet campaign, exploiting every difference views between some of the parties. The aim is to discredit socialism, isolate t Communists, cut them off from their allies, undermine confidence in socialism as the r

ernative to capitalism. This is accompanied by efforts to integrate the Communist and
orkers' parties in capitalist countries into the mechanism of state-monopoly capitalism.
perialist politicians pretend that peaceful coexistence implies also ideological
existence. At the same time, however, they continue their attacks on the Soviet Union,
ticularly on the questions of socialist democracy and of proletarian internationalism.
With the sharpening of the class struggle internally and internationally, the 23rd
nvention said, ideological questions have come to the fore in sharper focus than ever
ore. There can be no doubt that ideological work is of major importance to the Party
l the working class. And tendency to underestimate it, to show a disregard for theory,
be indifferent to deviations, to permissiveness or liberalism, must be firmly combated.
lure to do this can harm the cause of our Party and the cause of socialism.
The ideological struggle demands much greater effort to the circulation of Marxist-
ninist publications. Particular attention should be given to increasing sales of *World
rxist Review* and *Communist Viewpoint*. Some improvements have been made in this
nection, but they are not enough.
n our ideological struggle we had to deal with three questions of principle. We have
ed our position on these questions in the Draft Policy Statement adopted by the
vention. We have no intension of interfering in the internal affairs of other parties. We
 only summed up our views. The first question is: What is the road to socialism. That
, as our Convention stated, can be peaceful or non-peaceful, parliamentary or non-
amentary, multi-party or one-party. But for all their diversity, these forms converge
e central question: dictatorship of the proletariat, or as we call it in our Programme,
Road to Socialism in Canada", the "political power of the working class". There can
o equivocation on this.
ut there is another aspect: the ability of the working class to defend itself once has
eved political power. Bourgeois-reformist "pluralism" is sometimes used to justify an
vocal position. But there can be no equivocation on this question either. The working
 and its allies must not only be able to win power, but also *to defend* it. Otherwise the
ation might take a tragic turn, as was the case in Chile. So the road to socialism is not
bstraction. Our Programme places the question quite clearly.
nd still another aspect: the inference is made that the parliamentary road is
ocratic, while the non-parliamentary road is non-democratic. That this conclusion is
olutely unfounded was stressed by the Convention. The democratic character of the
olution, whatever its forms, is decided by the fact that the majority of the people are
olved in it and, above all, by its aims, which are to win and uphold majority power.
The second question of principle which came up for debate was that of
rnationalism. Imperialism questions the independence of Communist parties. What
rries it is not the independence of our parties, which are free and sovereign, but the way
y apply the principles of proletarian internationalism.
There can be no objection to laying stress on the national peculiarities and traditions of
 or that country, this or that working class. The creative approach to the specifics of
's own country is one thing. This needs to be developed to the maximum. But to place
 national in opposition to the international, to the general, means to throw out that
ch is constant and permanent and thereby imperil the success of the struggle. Our
ty has always firmly adhered to a position of patriotism and internationalism and will
tinue to do so.
There is another side to this question—the tendency to denigrate international
darity or distort its meaning. Clearly, in the real world we live in, where imperialism is
 powerful, where neocolonialism still exists, where monopoly and the multinational
porations are still powerful and decisive factors, to ignore, play down or side-step
rnational solidarity could be extremely dangerous. Imperialism remains an enemy of
nkind, a threat to world peace. It remains the enemy of the working class and all
king people in each capitalist country. Since imperialism's nature has not changed,
e it remains the same as before, the role of proletarian internationalism, too, remains

the same. Indeed, as it was stressed at the 23rd Convention of our Party, at the present stage of the struggle, when the positions of the working class must be reinforced and widened on a world scale, the significance of internationalism has increased, not decreased.

We should not forget that proletarian internationalism is not only a question of international solidarity. It is above all agreement on the general laws of revolutionary change. And it is not accidental that the imperialist attack has centred on this issue, too, particularly on the fundamental question of the state and working-class political power. Marxism-Leninism has clearly established that to achieve socialism a socialist revolution is necessary, that is, the transfer of power from the capitalist class to the working class and its allies.

The third question of principle concerns attempts to renounce the leading role of the working class and its Party, including its basic principle of organisation and activity, democratic centralism. As we understand it, a Communist Party is a free association of like-minded people organised to combat capitalist ideology and uphold and advance a definite world outlook, Marxism. Inability to do that, uphold the class independence of the proletariat, opens the road to the liquidation of the Party. To succumb to liberalism, to a "do-it-yourself", ideology, individualism, factionalism, would not only wreck the Party, but also obstruct the working class struggle against exploitation and for socialism.

If we are correctly to advance the leading role of the Party, combine democracy and centralism to ensure maximum cohesion and unity of our ranks and the development of criticism and self-criticism, there must be a creative approach to, and application of, our policies in line with the changing situation, while strictly adhering to decisions once made.

Our Party has organised a number of seminars in different parts of the country on these questions. Obviously, we must go beyond that. We need more in-depth analysis of cardinal problems, always guided by the Party Programme—"The Road to Socialism in Canada".

Revisionism and opportunism are at this point the main danger to combat. At the same time we must be alert to leftism and sectarianism, to dogmatic thinking, all of which would isolate us from the working people and prevent our Party from playing the role it can and must play in this period of great change.

The Communist Party of Canada bases itself on the principles of Marxism-Leninism, proletarian internationalism and the laws of revolutionary change. There must be no confusion between principles and tactics here. The decisions of the 23rd Party Convention has shown that firmness in principle and flexibility in tactics will continue to be our immutable guideline.

We Communists have been called revolutionary optimists, and with good reason. Yes, we are historical optimists, for the world has entered an epoch of radical social change, and imperialism is powerless to alter this basic fact. The Communist Party of Canada will do its utmost for the Canadian people to be part of this historic process, opening a new chapter for our country and people—a truly independent and socialist Canada.

[1] The Quebec election last November was regarded in bourgeois quarters as a victory for separatism. But the Communist Party believes that by voting against the Bourassa government the working people voted for a change, and not for separatism. They opposed a policy designed to shift onto them the burden of the crisis brought about by the evils of capitalism. Furthermore, the Quebec election returns show the crisis of confederation has to be dealt with in real earnest.

Reflections on the 1,000 Days of Popular Unity Rule

VOLODIA TEITELBOIM
Political Commission member, CC, Communist Party of Chile

LENIN took careful account of the lessons of the Paris Commune and the 1905-07 revolution in Russia to evolve on their basis the strategy and tactics which in 1917 led to the victorious October Revolution. Similarly, it is essential for Chileans to make a deep study of the 1,000 days of Popular Unity rule, in all the diversity of its typical and atypical factors and features, and draw proper theoretical and practical conclusions. By analysing the highly valuable data at our disposal, we can—in a definite social microworld, within the bounds of a small country of 10 million—ascertain the characteristics of a political drama of universal significance. We can make a sober assessment of the achievements and miscalculations of the popular movement, of its correct moves and its mistakes. The evidence we have also makes it possible and necessary to study the enemy's methods and devices, to compile a veritable manual showing how present-day counter-revolution can strangle revolution.

To be sure, the only political value of such manuals is that they point to a specific example governed by general laws, with all the peculiarities of place and time that characterise every revolution and every counter-revolution.

We will endeavour to examine the past impartially and self-critically, suggest correctives to our activity and reveal the overt and covert lines of enemy action, all of which is bound to make for greater clarity regarding our strategy and tactics, as well as those of the enemy. This will be the prologue to introducing corrections into our activity to transform the people's defeat into victory.

The Role of Elections and the "Peaceful Path"

We think the events in Chile indicate, in the final analysis, that, given definite circumstances resulting from a complex course of historical evolution and from painstaking building up of forces and uniting all the strata striving for social change, it is possible to achieve through elections much more than an ordinary or even a considerable electoral victory and, on the other hand, much less than real power. Those events also show that no electoral victory holds a guarantee of its solidity. Such a victory can be a notable advance on a long and generally thorny path abounding in dangerous curves and crossings and often skirting a precipice. But unless victory in elections is followed up by a vast offensive of a popular majority to turn it into real power which the masses would be willing and able to hold and defend against all obstacles, against all attempts by enemies at home and abroad to ignore and do away with this power, the result may be, or is even bound to be, defeat.

Indeed, victory in elections brings power only in part. Being the beginning of a new stage in the revolutionary process and the completion of previous stages, it does not come overnight but is a result of the revolutionary process as a whole, of a growing structural crisis in the country stemming from the deterioration of the general crisis of capitalism. It is the ultimate result of the accumulation of preliminary factors reflecting the maturing of diverse forms of class struggle.

That was how a pre-revolutionary situation shaped up in Chile. The Communist Party regarded elections as a form of action in the struggle to transform society, and this it required winning majority support.

"Political majority" means something more solid and complete than a relative or absolute majority of votes. *To a greater extent than an arithmetical (or mechanical) majority, it must be expressive of the existence of a representative social bloc of the greater*

part of the population. Besides, it must be an *active majority*, one not only operating continuously (which is typical of any steadily developing movement) but realising the need to uphold by every possible means the gains made.

Yet *during the growing revolutionary process in Chile, the forms of the struggle were considered as important as its goals. Form was exalted to the rank of substance, as it were, and an absolute was made of one path. This was undoubtedly a mistake*, for when the concrete situation changed, the masses found their hands tied. While the peaceful development of the revolution was in keeping with prevailing conditions and expressed the will of the popular movement, it was far from being in harmony with the mood of an enemy ready to stop the revolution at all costs and by every means, including means that were anything but peaceful. This must be borne in mind. The enemy's bellicosity and aggressiveness should never come as a surprise to revolutionaries. The enemy will always do his utmost to put up resistance. He will grasp every chance to take up arms against the people.

Every phenomenon or development is dialectically influenced by diverse factors and every concrete truth has fundamental and secondary aspects. In the light of past events, we consider that in the case of Chile the political factor certainly played the main role in the interconnection of the political and the military factor. The latter factor is a part of the former, but an essential one. Hence the immense significance of the military policy of the polular movement. It implies more than merely adopting a definite position towards the army and establishing a solid alliance with its potentially democratic part. It implies forming a force that could make common cause, as far as possible, with the section of the army loyal to the revolution.

Experience has shown that our advance must be safeguarded not only by popular, but also by adequate military support. And the precondition for that is a constructive policy on this issue (with the Communists assuming special responsibility, of course).

Possibilities of Changing the Path

It is vitally important, therefore, to restore to the revolution (in our conceptions of it) its highly dialectical nature, always bearing in mind that this is a process that can change depending on the course of the struggle, and that at times its revolution can accelerate to the point of dictating other forms of struggle, as was the case in Russia in 1917. In other words, we must take no absolute of this or that path of the revolution, must not consider that the choice of path is final and may not be revised, or that one and the same principle should be used invariably throughout a long period of history. Switching from one form of struggle to another in other countries may not take place as rapidly as it did in Russia in the few months preceding the October Revolution. But our negative experience suggests that it is wrong in general to attribute an *unchanging* character to any particular form of struggle, to treat it as a *constant* making it possible to disregard changes in the situation, often abrupt ones, caused especially by political crises and growing contradictions.

"Peaceful path" is a correct term only in so far as it rules out civil war. But because of the many vicissitudes, it cannot bypass the law which says that violence is the "midwife" of history. We should have always borne this in mind, should have remembered that the very act of changing path presupposes "changing horses" and continuing our advance. It is hard to change horses in mid-stream. But then it is harder still when no preparations have been made beforehand. Irrespective of how clearly the necessity for the change is realised, the very possibility of such a change and the ability to carry it out must certainly be guaranteed. This is not a matter that can be settled at the moment of change; it requires advance preparations, which may even take years, and this is what Chile's popular movement failed to do. The revolutionary vanguard marching at the head of the masses must be really prepared to adopt if necessary the most vigorous measures against a reactionary onslaught.

What happened in Chile under Popular Unity rule was that many regarded preparations for an eventual change of path and forms of struggle as absolutely

unacceptable. Another lesson taught to Popular Unity is that an atmosphere of legality admittedly makes for stricter enforcement of laws and hence gives revolutionaries more strength and can, in the end, help them to make rapid progress but that in definite cases it can contribute to enemy plans for a rebellion or coup. Unless this is properly understood, legality itself may be used for tying the people's hands and making it even harder for them to exercise their right to legitimate defence. The people have no reason to feel bound hand and foot by legality like a Gulliver. They should regard it as a useful weapon in upholding their just cause, but never as a trap or gag.

In setting up the machinery of their conspiracy, reaction and fascism in Chile harped on absurd accusations against the Popular Unity government, saying that it had trespassed the bounds of legality. What they were after was to trample all legality underfoot (as if developing in their own way Odilon Barrot's statement, "Legality is killing us",[1] they set out to implement the slogan, "Let us kill legality"). Developments showed, in particular, that they turned the arms control law into a trap for the people by using it to disarm and crush them.

All this confirms the need to respect a fundamental demand: reliance on the masses. We have said that the peaceful path is practicable only if the idea of the revolution wins the minds of the majority of the people and prompts it to act. When the forces favouring change have achieved overwhelming superiority no opportunities are left for a reactionary rising, let alone for its success. The idea of majority, which Lenin considered so important ("the majority of the people are *for* us," he said in September 1917) retains its validity as a requisite of victory whatever the form of struggle.

Consequently, the alignment of forces is of decisive importance. We must always, I think, see to it that the front of advocates of change is stronger than that of their opponents and that this superiority is considerable numerically and organisationally, as well as in terms of political, ideological, cultural, propaganda and all other activities. In other words, this broad front would be stronger in regard to the quality and solidarity of the alliance, to the dynamism and effectiveness of its united action. Also its programme must be the common denominator of all factors and the elements and forces making it up. On this basis, they must operate in co-ordinated fashion, on the principles of tactical and strategic unity, as they strike joint blows in one and the same direction. It is only in this way—by operating as a genuine coalition, avoiding the rise of opposed poles or disunited action inside the movement and by developing a common programme line—that the enemy can be defeated. The preservation and extension of the scope and strength of the front and the consolidation of the majority are a vitally important factor, as experience has shown, for the advance of the revolutionary process.

I repeat, the enemy will use force for as long as he can. The revolution can do without bloodshed, but only if the majority can impose this and the minority cannot prevent it. This could have been true of the period our country went through in the closing months of 1970 and partly in 1971. However, the enemy will always do his utmost to regain his strength. Hence it is not a question of only one moment of danger, for there is danger as long as there exist reactionary forces and it increases when reaction succeeds in reversing the situation in its favour.

Consequently, the problem of the balance of forces makes it necessary to take account of its inconstancy and likely changes. It is not established once and for all except when the revolution, having consolidated its positions, overcomes this internal contradiction and eliminates antagonistic classes to build a classless society.

Throughout the period of Popular Unity rule, Chile was under a kind of dual power, which cannot, of course, be compared to the situation in Russia in 1917. In Chile there was a lawful popular government and, on the other hand, an unlawful reactionary power backed by all who earlier had dominated society. In addition to certain key economic and financial levers and the mass media, that reactionary power controlled a considerable part of the state apparatus. It skilfully exploited the miscalculations and incompetence of Popular Unity and the existence of different trends in it to bring the petty-bourgeoisie into

the effort to carry out reaction's plans. This large social stratum is often undecided, being attached to its own values and frightened by the stories which the enemy's machinery of psychological terror continuously spreads. The enemy knew full well that he would get nowhere unless he won the support of the intermediate strata and influenced the heterogeneous group of people differing in political consciousness, ideology and behaviour in the climate of hysteria cunningly created through the efforts of the CIA. If the oligarchy made certain gains through its strategy of winning over the masses it was only because it had the support of other strata not belonging to its class. It succeeded in this because there was no adequate counteraction from the other side, that is, because the popular movement had no policy linking up with the programme of the movement and inspiring the intermediate social strata with confidence that they, too, would have a place in the new society.

Responsibility of the Vanguard

The decisive factor for the outcome of the struggle in favour of the people is, undoubtedly, correct leadership of the popular movement, a leadership capable of giving the masses proper guidance, keeping them informed, mobilising them for this or that necessary action and making this political majority fully aware of its responsibility and turning it into a totality of politically conscious and united forces. Needless to say, the Communist Party plays an essential role in this, as do the other popular front parties.

The Chilean popular movement doubtlessly has historic achievements to its credit and showed creative initiative throughout the period of Popular Unity rule. There developed rudimentary forms of democratic government that sprang from a people determined to change the class nature of the state, and that should be taken into account in the future as useful precedents of genuine democratic rule capable of keeping chaos under control.

However, Salvador Allende's assumption of the Presidency could not in itself alter the class nature of the state, the character of the armed forces, the police or the administrative machinery. This is why we stress that in any process following a peaceful course, it is most important to bring about an alignment of military forces in favour of revolutionary development. This is a key issue.

Popular Unity was faced with the pressing need to effect changes that would put the state apparatus under the people's organised pressure to the point of gradually placing it in the people's service. Furthermore, it was indispensable to promote active democracy involving the participation of the masses in the broadest sense of the term, strip the reactionaries of their spheres of domination and transfer all real power to the working people, to the progressive social strata.

There is no denying that in the three years it was in power, the Popular Unity government won the active support of the masses. However, confusion over the objectives—democratic or socialist ones—and the introduction of ideas alien to its programme, or based on sheer utopia made it impossible at any moment to give the initiative of the masses the right direction and secure majority support in solving every problem, as was the case with so patriotic a measure understandable to all as the nationalisation of the copper mines.

Let it be stressed that the sad conclusion of this chapter of history should not minimise the significance of so evident a reality of the past as the fact that in less than three years, the popular government made tremendous progress by scoring valuable gains which live on in the people's memory and are part of a lasting political patrimony (even though they were subsequently destroyed by the fascist regime). They became a legacy that will again play an important mobilising role when the country has overcome its present state. It would be wrong to underestimate this experience. We must give serious consideration to the vastly positive significance and great constructive contribution of a popular movement that was broken off so tragically.

However, we maintain that unless the masses are constantly schooled in political action and in assessing the political situation, they cannot by merely following their instinct rise

to the level of social awareness needed to defeat the enemy and participate consciously in making history. Hence *it is a duty of the Marxist-Leninist political vanguard,* of the Communists operating at home or abroad, *to provide the working class and the popular movement with scientific leadership at any moment,* even in the dire conditions of fascist rule. In fulfilling its fundamental mission, the Communist Party, the leading party responsible along with other parties, its allies, for the development of the revolutionary process, must solve a dialectical equation consisting of two elements: the *quality of its unity* with other forces of a popular movement not free of contradictions that can at times grow to dangerous proportions; and *its independent role* in this movement as a party which can under no circumstances, even amid discord, renounce its duty to present its policy to the people and country with a view to strengthening and not weakening unity.

How Present-day Counter-revolution Can Strangle Revolution

The positions of the representatives of the popular camp were undermined step by step, and eventually this became perfectly obvious and made for the success of the reactionary coup. Besides, there were shortcomings in the implementation of the working-class policy of alliances and the balance of forces in both the political and the military spheres deteriorated noticeably in the closing months. For all this, however, the negative epilogue of this period of the Chilean revolution was not due, as has been said, to the people's will, but to the crippling forcible interference and violent change brought on by the fascist coup.

It is necessary that the revolutionary process be supported by a popular majority. On the other hand, while this factor is indispensable, it does not guarantee the success of the revolution, whose progress may be upset and its gains nullified if the popular movement is unable to support the resolve of the majority through effective defence measures.

We do not mean arms alone. To achieve political results, imperialism and home reaction launched their offensive first of all in the economic sphere, that is, a sphere in which they were particularly strong and in which they could do it all the more easily. The economic offensive was combined with individual terror, which by now has become a widespread daily practice of Latin America's political reactionaries. The resulting situation was one of utter chaos, described by some as very well organised. It was organised by the CIA, which did not hesitate to use for the purpose an all-out propaganda offensive. Perhaps it was the first time that counter-revolution had used the mass media so thoroughly, on so large a scale and with such force. This is another page of history worthy of most careful study. Reaction's plans were furthered by the government's failure to take co-ordinated and organised counter-measures. The existence of two parallel policy lines within Popular Unity contributed to the success of reaction's conspiracy. Besides, the conspirators continuously took advantage of the ultra-revolutionaries' talk about armed forces, which they did not have.

What we are trying to say is that a war in which no guns are fired requires a common, clear-cut policy that must constantly be spelled out to the masses. It is not merely a question of properly organising intelligence and counter-intelligence. The task is to carry on a total political struggle aimed at disuniting the central forces of the conspiracy from top to bottom and in every respect—economically and psychologically, publicly and otherwise, but above all militarily.

Needed: A Reappraisal of the Issue of the Army

These bloody events cast a stark light on the role of the armed forces. Underestimation of this issue translated itself into a new tragedy for the people. What we witnessed was not a mere repetition of the past or a confirmation of the lessons of a long period of history. More than before, imperialism and its domestic allies are anxious to bring the army out of the barracks. This is due to the tacit admission that the development and growing strength of the popular movement more than ever endanger imperialist and capitalist control of society and the state. Revealingly, it is no longer a question of military actions, which have

been numerous in the 150-year-long history of Latin America's republics, that is, of a conspiracy against a high-ranking adventurer, of a simple replacement of a power-thirsty individual in the government palace. As a rule, now it is a matter of outright action against the popular movement, taken above all when reaction has no other means of preventing a victory of progressive forces or abolishing their gains.

This prompts us to reappraise the military question from today's point of view. No new approach to it is conceivable if we overlook the important fact that imperialism persistently seeks support among Latin American armies, which it tries to influence as an inseparable part of the forces implementing the Pentagon's global strategy. According to an imported doctrine accepted by certain domestic military leaders, the chief enemy today is not outside but inside the country and is called "internal subversion". At a certain juncture, the US military-industrial complex evolved the tactical principle of *Vietnamising the war,* which expected "Asians to kill Asians". Its present motto in our country virtually expects *"Chileans to kill Chileans",* which means that the armed forces *must wage war against their own people.* This would make it *easier for the imperialists* to assure their domination and plunder of Chile. In this context, Pinochet's statement in Uruguay that he had acted in the interests of imperialism was brazen tragicomedy. "The United States," he said, "did not fire a single shot to remove communism from Chile. It was no Vienam. No one was killed." Indeed, no US soldier was killed, but then many thousands of Chileans were. Pinochet disregards these deaths.

Certain Pentagon political and military strategists have said that their best investment is training Latin American officers in US military academies and import Pentagon thinking. Indeed, this is what they have done. Senator William Proxmire announced in 1971 that between 1945 and 1971 the US had spent $175,000m. on the training of 320,000 servicemen from 70 independent countries. In 1965, Robert Wood, then in charge of military aid, proudly said that almost all Latin American officers had received training in the *United States or in the Panama Canal Zone.*[3]

The imperialists are now reaping the fruits. In several Latin American countries, they have imposed reactionary military dictatorships in their service. And they are plotting to do the same elsewhere.

In learning the lessons of our own mistakes, we must therefore draw the following conclusion: to ensure that the revolution follows a peaceful course, we must prevent reactionaries in the armed forces from turning them into executioners and stranglers of the popular movement. In other words, we must see to it that the army stops playing the role of a super-police, that it does not operate as a domestic colonial force taking orders from the Pentagon, an insurance company or a pretorian guard protecting the interests of monopolies and latifundiun holders.

One of the greatest weaknesses of the Chilean popular movement was that this question was *posed* inadequately, narrowly and shyly as it were, preferably at the level of individuals, to the exclusion of parties having deep roots among the people, to the exclusion of the masses. For a long time, men shirking their duties remained in charge of the army and the police. The sentiments of many high-ranking officers were little known (the case of Pinochet is the most striking, but not the only one). The information services, honey-combed with subversives were disastrously incompetent. Besides, everything was affected by lack of unity in the government over the support for General Prats when he headed the cabinet and after his removal as commander-in-chief. It is our sincere opinion that we Communists, too, are to blame for that historical miscalculation, which was a result of the weakness and untenability of our military policy and our attitude to the armed forces.

How can a favourable change in the army be brought about? It is a very difficult task but undoubtedly a *feasible* one. To answer this question as correctly as possible, we must analyse the social nature of the army, its class composition and the mechanism of its activity, its changing functions in the course of history and its present role in society—in other words, the dialectics of its behaviour.

The armed forces of Latin American countries are no abstract institutions or sinister organisations destined inevitably and for ever to brutally suppress their peoples. There is no need to stress here the special character of the revolutionary armed forces of Cuba, brought into being by a victorious socialist revolution. But even in the armies of those countries of the continent where there has been no revolution, we are witnessing developments that do not entitle us to a fatalistic interpretation of their role or to extreme pessimism. Karl Marx distinguished two currents in the Spanish army (historically speaking, it bore a certain similarity to the armies of the countries of one-time Spanish America in atmosphere and as a school for the training and indoctrination of troops). He saw two incipient alternatives of social and political activity for it that manifest themselves to this day: an obtuse reactionary attitude and, at the same time, a potential for revolutionary initiative, as the rising led by Rafael Riego showed. This initiative can only manifest itself in periods of political crisis. Lenin pointed to the living connection between a developing revolutionary movement and its reflection in the armed forces, growing restlessness in the army. It must be admitted, however, that it was not this characteristic of the army that was the historic dominant, but the army's being the armed guarantee of a system based on oppression.

Chile had quite a few advocates of the theory of "particularism" of the army, who claimed that at a definite moment it adheres to "political neutrality". It is only right to point out that the army always acts under the decisive influence of this or that class or movement. It would be utopian to think of the army as being politically "neutral". *Not so when, in a definite situation, a period of neutralisation is brought about* as a result of struggle outside and within the armed forces to foil fascist plans aimed at involving the army in a reactionary coup. In this instance, the people can lean on those elements in the army that remain loyal to the constitution. Within the framework of the concept of peaceful development of the revolution, this *neutralisation* can have a certain effect for a time.

A very important factor to be borne in mind is, of course, the class origin of the military. However, the fact that most members of the armed services come ultimately from the working class and poor peasantry manifests itself on a mass scale only under the impact of a revolutionary situation and provided there exists an organisation in the barracks that is carrying on definite ideological work.

The point is that a false social consciousness and a false conception of public duty are imposed on the military, or at least on many of them, and that this makes effective ideological and political work on our part all the more necessary.

According to a view commonly held by students of this problem, there was evidence of three currents in the Chilean army prior to the coup. They are classified—without sufficient scientific accuracy—as follows: (1) patriotic servicemen, or "constitutionalists"; (2) servicemen loyal to their professional duty, and (3) servicemen favouring fascism. This classification is more or less close to the truth and retains its validity. However, it would be mechanistic to overlook the changes subsequently brought about by the operation of internal and external factors. The struggle, including the ideological struggle, which, of course, is going on in Chilean society in spite of the monopoly of the mass media held by a totalitarian state, has its effect on the armed forces as well. The country's anti-fascist forces, its popular and democratic movement, can and should contribute actively to this struggle.

There are objective prerequisites for this: a deep-rooted, disastrous economic crisis; a political vacuum around the junta, the international isolation of the regime, and the hatred which the vast majority of the population feel for it. Today, three years after the imposition of the dictatorship, various subjective factors are maturing too. The role of the working class has increased over the past year. The Communist Party perseveres in its guiding role, braving savage repression. Its organisations are active throughout the country. The major popular opposition parties are reorganising at the national level. Discord within the ruling group is mounting. There is more and more evidence of

vacillation in army circles, which daily witness growing condemnation of the junta by a population convinced that the military clique, far from solving any of the country's problems, has aggravated them. More and more people in the army condemn the unbridled terrorism and unprecedented brutality of the junta and the countless abuses of DINA. The activities of this agency, which depends directly on Pinochet, are marked by a *sinister man-hunt and increasingly numerous lists of "missing persons" containing the* names of prisoners of Chile's gestapo whose arrest the regime refuses to admit.

We know that hastening the end of today's nightmare, of the people's suffering, depends largely on ourselves, on the activity of Popular Unity and the anti-fascist forces generally. In drawing numerous lessons from the Chilean experience, many of which are bitter while others are instructive, and all of which are equally useful, we consider that by carrying on a selfless, extremely dangerous but increasingly widespread and organised struggle, the *people will pave the way for changing the situation*. This will make it possible not only to *return Chile to its people when the time comes* but to contribute to the elaboration of *certain pressing theoretical and political problems*.

* * *

From the WMR Commission for the Exchange of Party Experience

Comrade Teitelboim's article is the first in a series of articles about the lessons of the Chilean revolution to be published in this journal by leading members of the Communist Party of Chile. *WMR* has already carried material on this subject but the Party is continuing to analyse events their consequences, new facts and the urgent problems of the revolutionary process. Under an agreement reached with the CC of the Communist Party *of Chile, further articles will deal with the following subjects:*

—the relationship between the democratic and socialist stages of the Chilean revolution;

—problems of winning power and the experience of peaceful development of the revolution at this stage;

—*the role of the working class in the Chilean* revolution, the role of the Communist Party and the policy of alliances;

—the problem of holding and exercising power, and the causes of the temporary defeat of the Chilean revolution;

—new forms of resisting reaction, and the imperialist weapon of "psychological warfare";

—external factors in the temporary defeat of the Chilean revolution, and the international character of the activity of revolutionary, counter-revolutionary forces.

---

[1] Odilon Barrot, conservative politician of the French Second Republic. His statement "Legality is killing us", betrayed the intention of reaction late in 1848 and early in 1849 to provoke a popular rising, quell it and restore the monarchy. See Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, *Sel. Works*, Vol. 1, p. 202.

[2] See Fernando Rivas y Elizabeth Reimann, *Un caso de penetracion imperialista*. Ediciones 75, Mexico City, p. 7.

The Progressive Programme and Working People's Activity

ACHUTHA MENON
Member of the National Council, Communist Party of India; Chief Minister of Kerala State

THE 20-point programme[1] announced by Prime Minister Indira Gandhi on July 1, 1975, has been rightly named an important landmark in the political and economic development of India in recent times. The Communist Party of India has welcomed the programme and is mobilising mass support for it. We have had considerable success in this in Kerala, where power is in the hands of the Left-Democratic United Front, and the coalition government has been headed by representatives of the Communist Party since 1969.[2]

But so far as Kerala is concerned, many of the items of the programme are not new. They are only a reiteration or a continuation of what we have been doing since 1969 and particularly since September 1970, when the prescheduled elections consolidated the positions of the United Front government appreciably. Such items as confiscation of excess lands from big landowners and handing them over to landless peasants and agricultural labourers, provision of house sites for the poor and landless people, and other items benefiting the poor, are contained in the minimum programme proclaimed by the United Front in Kerala way back in 1967.

The Kerala government had passed a law abolishing bondage labour before this was announced in the 20-point programme. And it went further than just raising the minimum wage for agricultural workers; it passed an act which provides some kind of stability of occupation for agricultural labour. There is also a clause for the creation of material aid and old-wage pension funds.

Nevertheless, there is no doubt that the 20-point programme accelerated the implementation of progressive measures in Kerala and added to our vigour, determination and possibilities. The parties forming the Kerala government now have a deeper understanding of the paramount importance of such measures in the struggle against reaction and of the countrywide significance of the policy they began to pursue long before July 1975.

I shall cite some facts and figures. For instance, during the five years and eight months, from January 1, 1970, to August 31, 1975, the total number of cultivating tenants and homestead builders on whom permanent rights of ownership were conferred was 967,100; whereas from September 1, 1975, to June 1, 1976—a short period of nine months—the number came to 978,100. Or let us take another issue—the taking over of excess lands. From January 1970 to August 1975, 56,400 acres of land were taken over from big landowners in Kerala State, and in the following nine months another 36,400 acres were expropriated.

The implementation of the programme depends to a very great extent on the political orientation of the masses, on their consciousness and organisation. Now that the law is on their side and public opinion supports the government programme, this objective can be achieved more easily. But merely because of these facts the programme cannot get implemented automatically. Even in Kerala, where we have advanced far more than other States, there are serious lags in its implementation where the masses are not organised. For instance, the minimum wage law has been fully enforced only in areas where agricultural labour is properly organised, where they are conscious of their rights and will assert these rights. Whereas in other areas of Kerala where the workers are poorly organised, they have to make do with a wage that is far below the minimum prescribed by law.

Take another example. One of the items in the 20-point programme is the abolition or

scaling down of the debts which agricultural labourers, poor peasants, smallholders, village artisans and other categories of working people owe to the landlords or money-lenders. The respective laws have already been enacted in some States. But it is not enough just to proclaim the abolition of debts. It is necessary and urgent to set up an alternative source of credit for the poorest sections of the population through co-operative or state credit institutions. Unless you set up such an organisation, the poor man is once again in the hands of the money-lender who will give him credits at exorbitant rates of interest. This causes much suffering in many parts of India. The problem was discussed at length at a conference of chief State ministers in Delhi which previewed the 20-point programme, and it was at that time that I, on behalf of the Kerala government, pointed to the urgent need for a source of credit for rural workers.

Since the question of credit is of vital importance to the mass of the rural workers, I should like to outline our experience in resolving it.

According to a survey conducted by the Kerala State Planning Board in September 1975, the total outstanding rural indebtedness in 1971 amounted to Rs. 1,000 million. As against this, lending by institutional organisations (nationalised and commercial banks, co-operative societies) amounted to Rs. 590 million. Thus the quantum of borrowings of rural households in Kerala from non-institutional (private) agencies has been estimated to range between Rs. 360 and Rs. 410 million. The quantum of outstanding non-institutional borrowings attributable to small cultivators, agricultural labourers and artisans may be in the range of Rs. 240 to Rs. 270 million. This would represent the minimum magniture of credit gap vis-a-vis requirements of the above groups of the rural population. In other words, any arrangement to meet the credit gap of the weaker sections of the rural population will have to shoulder the responsibility of advancing a minimum of Rs. 240 to Rs. 270 million. This problem had to be tackled by the Kerala State government.

It was not possible for the government to advance this amount. The rural banks proposed by the central government, which are to be started in various parts of India, would also not be able to meet the situation. For the coverage would be so meagre as to be totally ineffective. For instance, Kerala would get only one—or at best two—of the rural banks to be set up by the Government of India, and that too would have taken a long time. It is to be noted that no bank has yet been started in Kerala although it is ten months since the announcement came. Even if the banks had been started, it would have been impossible to cover all the villages of Kerala by setting up branches throughout the State.

It was in this context that the State government thought of mobilising resources through our own co-operative institutions. Kerala has a viable and strong credit structure in the co-operative sector with the Kerala State Co-operative Bank at the State level, the Central Co-operative Banks at the District levels and Primary Service Co-operative Societies/Banks at the village level. This structure distributes the sums granted by the Reserve Bank of India and has been meeting the requirements of short- or medium-term agricultural loans of the rural population to a significant extent (Rs. 496 million in 1974-75). But according to the rules laid down by the Reserve Bank of India, its credit can be utilised only for the purposes of agricultural production, and adequate security must be given for those loans in the form of either land or standing crops. Therefore, two things emerge: First, even the smallholder or marginal farmer who has some farm of security to offer can get credit only for productive purposes and nothing at all for his personal and family needs which cannot altogether be avoided. Secondly, agricultural labourers, poor artisans, casual labourers, petty traders, etc. who have no sort of security to offer are completely denied any credit from this source.

However, the co-operative societies in Kerala used to fulfil the non-agricultural requirements of the rural people also to a limited extent by using their own resources which are called "Owned Funds" of these co-operatives. The only way to meet these requirements is for the co-operatives to mobilise resources through deposits of their own.

It was under these circumstances that the Kerala State government, in consultation with the State's co-operative banks, evolved a scheme for deposit mobilisation. It was thought

possible to mobilise about Rs. 200 million by organising a mobilisation month in April 1976. An all-out effort was made by the Kerala State Co-operative Bank, 11 District Co-operative Banks, 41 Urban Co-operative Banks, and 1,000 selected Primary Co-operative Societies.

Organisational arrangements for efficiently conducting the mobilisation throughout the month were made. Each Minister was put in charge of one of the 11 districts of Kerala. All of them worked very hard along with District Collectors, Members of the Legislative Assembly and other representatives of the people, Panchayat members, Co-operators, etc., to approach the people and canvas deposits. Instructions were given to approach every household through small squads and request them to deposit whatever little savings they had in the primary co-operatives, or in the District or State Co-operative Banks.

I am very glad to say that the programme worked wonderfully well. The response of the people was spontaneous. The meetings held in pursuance of the Deposit Mobilisation campaign were a tremendous success. Thousands and thousands of people gathered at all these meetings among whom the poor sections, viz, the village artisans, the agricultural labourers, the small and marginal farmers, etc. dominated. The final accounts are not yet in, but it is beyond doubt that more than Rs. 200 million worth of deposits have been collected.

Out of the total sum of mobilised resources, 65 per cent have been allocated for production purposes, and 10 per cent for consumption purposes—for meeting educational expenses, marriages (but not dowries), illness, etc. Advances to scheduled castes and scheduled tribes receive special attention; they are granted loans on favourable terms, including a concession in the rate of interest.

Thus Kerala's experience has shown that fulfilment of the government's 20-point programme is inconceivable without concrete actions by the local authorities, without extensive explanatory and mobilisation work among the working people, without the support of the people at large.

Now, it may be asked whether the administrative machinery is adequate for the fulfilment of this programme, and whether any alternatives or modifications to the existing machinery or a thorough overhaul of the entire machinery, will be required in order to implement the programme fully. Kerala's experience may not fully correspond to the experience of other States, but I do not think that the situation in other States differs fundamentally from that of Kerala.

Taking Kerala's official organs as a whole, you cannot say that they are not imbued with a bureaucratic spirit, but at the same time it must be clearly stated that there are elements insude this machinery who are really eager to help implement the programme. Certain district collectors, law offices, and the offices of agricultural and other departments are very enthusiastic in carrying out progressive measures. We held several conferences and seminars during the last few months, and we could see that some of these officials were in good rapport with the people. They could understand the problems of the people and are willing to help them; they could explain things to the people in their own language; in simple language they explained the government's schemes and told them how they could improve their position.

But although there are honest and energetic officials who sympathise with the people, the machinery as a whole is not adequate or really attuned to the carrying out of the 20-point programme. And if we want to go ahead and include other programmes to further develop our economy, the existing machinery is certainly going to be a hindrance.

After the announcement of the 20-point programme, the question of setting up an implementation machinery was very urgent. And it was stated at that time by the Prime Minister as well as by the INC President that implementation committees would be set up (at State, district, block and other levels) consisting of representatives of political parties who are willing to carry out the programme. We have set up such committees in Kerala, but not below the district level. Experience has shown that they can be useful and effective, but only to a certain extent, for they cannot act on their own initiative; they can only

"urge" the administration on.

I have heard that these committees are ineffective in some States, that they are seldom convened. Ours is a different situation. The Kerala government has laid down that the committees should meet at least once a fortnight to discuss current questions concerning the fulfilment of the 20-point programme. Of course, differences arise, since many political parties are represented. But in most cases decisions are unanimous and binding upon all.

In all the development schemes or activities that we took up during the last five years or so, we found the panchayat, that is the popular machinery at the lowest level in our State, to be very helpful. Take, for instance, the housing scheme, under which every panchayat is to build a hundred houses for the homeless. The land was provided by the State government, but money had to be mobilised on a big scale from the public. On the initiative of the Chief Minister, the State government set up a housing fund out of contributions from the public or government offices, from merchants, landlords, other well-off groups of the population. A big sum was collected. To spend this money judiciously, we asked the panchayat presidents to convene committees consisting of panchayat members who are willing and eager to help in the building campaign, irrespective of the parties to which they belonged. We also called on them to participate actively in the work of the building committees, which included, among others, representatives of political parties. The duty of the building committees was not only to select the plots, but also to supervise the actual construction work. In all such matters panchayat presidents took a very great interest, as did panchayat members, although differences arose between the representatives of political parties.

All this also applies to the construction of village dispensaries. Here too a lot of co-operation from the common people was necessary because what the government said was: if each panchayat gives one acre of land and promises to put up a proper building for the panchayat dispensary, the government will provide it with the required staff, equipment and medicines. This programme was taken up by most of the panchayats very enthusiastically and they succeeded in implementing it. Land development and irrigation programmes also enjoyed the energetic support of the population. So on the whole, as experience has shown, the mass of the poor willingly participate in such programmes and their support is indispensable for success.

Of course difficulties do arise. The reforms being carried out in Kerala cause a clashing of class interests. The local landlords and the representatives of other propertied groups sometimes get a big section of the population to follow them, and this hampers the progress of the reforms. So what we evidently need is democratic organisation of the working masses so as to intensify their support for the government's progressive measures and, so to say, arm them politically for the struggle for their rights and interests. There would thus be broader possibilities for neutralising the subversive acts of the reactionary circles.

In this connection I would like to note that we have set up land reforms boards consisting of representatives of the people, and these boards have speeded up the implementation of the land reforms in Kerala. Organised actions by the working people are absolutely necessary in such a matter as countrywide enforcement of the minimum wage law. What have labour conflicts shown us? In a conflict situation the agricultural worker naturally goes to the labour officer. The nature of the settlement of the dispute depends largely on the subjective factor—the political convictions of this civil servant. If he does not sympathise with the worker, the latter is defenceless in the dispute. The only thing that the worker can do is to join a united and politically conscious organisation which defends the rights of agricultural workers and promotes the land reform programme.

To conclude, a few words about the conduct of the opposition organisations in our State, including the so-called parallel Communist Party, which sides with the right-wing parties. While not offering strong resistance to the implementation of the measures

stipulated in the 20-point programme, the leaders of that party try to question its progressive nature. They claim to have long ago put forward demands which go further than the items in the programme, and that there is nothing "revolutionary or extraordinary" in it.

Without delving into the soundness of these assertions, we affirm that what is important is not how long ago this or that goal was proclaimed, but what has been done to achieve it. We Communists are well aware of the limitations of the programme. We know, for example, that it does not touch the industrial field at all, nor does it raise the question of equal pay for equal work. But at the same time we believe that it creates favourable conditions for progressive changes in the country's social and economic life—changes that would open the way to further advancement. And the important thing is not to argue, but to organise and inspire the masses to fight for the fulfilment of the programme.

In the context of India, this is the most constructive approach, for it accords with the demands of the struggle for the unity of all patriotic and progressive forces who want to put India on the road of socio-economic reforms of a national-democratic nature. The Communist Party of India has been consistent in pursuing this line, and the coalition government in Kerala State has proved its soundness in practice.

---

[1] This programme envisages measures to solve the country's acute social and economic problems. For more details see N. K. Krishnan, "A Sharp Turn", *WMR*, October 1975, and M. Sen, "Positive Trends Gaining the Upper Hand in India", August 1976—*Ed.*

[2] For details on the situation in which the government of Kerala State is operating, see A. Menon, "Left-Democratic Coalition in Power", *WMR*, November 1973—*Ed.*

For a Big Mass Communist Party

SEBASTIAN ZAPIRAIN
CC member, Communist Party of Spain

In the past year, WMR *has carried a series of articles on problems of building a Marxist-Leninist mass party and on the struggle to strengthen it and increase its influence.[1] Authors from the Communist parties of Argentina, Greece, France, Italy, India, the Soviet Union and Finland have exchanged views and compared notes. This is a further contribution to the series.*

THE Communist Party of Spain has never stopped fighting, not even in times of repression and persecution, which have been part of its 56-year-long history (except the few years of the Republic and civil war). It has repeatedly set examples of staunchness and has never retreated before difficulties. It has resisted opportunism and extremism and, never deviating from its line, has invariably insisted that Spain is faced, as in the past, with the dilemma: either fascist dictatorship, or democracy.

In the days of the Franco dictatorship, when the slightest opposition to the regime was persecuted in a brutal, barbarous manner, our Party, operating in harsh illegal conditions, stressed the need to wrest from the dictatorship political and social rights for the working class and the people. It was the first to all for "freedom zones"[2] paving the way for those rights.

The struggle for "freedom zones" has required much sacrifice and devotion on our part but now, in common with us, the whole democratic opposition accepts the orientation towards winning these "zones" as a strategy of transforming Spain into a democratic state. The sacrifices made by members of our Party and the lives given in the struggle against the Franco dictatorship have not been in vain. We can say that the prestige of the Communist Party of Spain and its close links with the masses are an obvious fact and that a vast

number of working people in town and country, intellectuals, women and youth consider us their most authoritative spokesmen.

All the political parties and alignments that have been officially recognised or operate in semi-legal conditions are striving to organise. We Spanish Communists, who have always worked to organise and expand our Party, are doing all in our power to win new members, strengthen the Party and extend our political actions for democracy and socialism on the basis of unity.

We are convinced that a strong and organised Communist party is needed to bring about changes and reforms in the Spanish state. We have won numerous "freedom zones" and are effectively carrying on a policy which we define as "coming to the surface", in spite of the scepticism of those who did not believe our objectives to be attainable. Officially, however, our status is still illegal. This situation, arbitrarily imposed on us, will not be, and no longer is, an insurmountable obstacle to strengthening, developing and organising the mass party we need.

Where local leaders of our Party have found and properly used flexible forms of organisation, we have brought into being associations of working men and women that will provide the basis for moving on to a higher organisational stage the day we come out of illegality. A massive influx of new members will reinforce our Party's positions in the factories and on building sites, among various contingents of industrial workers; among farm hands, as well as farmers and stock-breeders, who are all ruthlessly exploited; among bank and government employees fighting for their demands; among members of liberal professions, among actors, students, teachers, and academics. Their struggle has shown the need to form organisations of a mass Communist party among cultural workers.

The Communist Party of Spain, the United Socialist Party of Catalonia (Catalan Communists), the Communist Party of the Basque Country and the Communist Party of Galicia had a very active part in recent strikes and demonstrations, with the result that in many cases throughout the country applications for Party membership were submitted collectively (at meetings or mass rallies). This was a big leap and we have reason to say that ours is becoming a mass party with roots in every public sphere, a militant and staunch party prepared for united action with other political forces and respecting the numerous currents, groups and parties that are willing to fight for democratic change.

No one in Spain today doubts our Party's strength or influence. Nevertheless, retrograde elements, the ultra rightists, and the government which yields to the pressure of reaction, try to exclude it from public life. We counter these attempts to continue the Franco regime without Franco by our resolute efforts to raise Party membership to 300,000 or more before long. Although some may not agree, for it is a question of almost trebling the membership this can be done, as the facts show. On analysing the methods used for trebling the membership of an already large branch organisation in Barcelona Province, Catalonia, its leader listed the following factors: "The Party's coming to the surface through lectures, press conferences and public meetings at which our policy is spelled out; utilisation of the Party's spheres of influence, of legal organisations, mass movements, enterprises, offices, educational institutions, and so on". He noted that "at a steel plant which had a sizable organisation already, half of the 60 workers attending a shop meeting joined the Party". Lectures on Party policy is still another recruiting method: The Party branch of an enterprise, district or of members of liberal professions invites 50, 200, 300 or more people linked associated with mass movements and known for their anti-Franco views or for their integrity. Leading Party members who deliver the lecture acquaint them with our programme, answer their questions, dispel their doubts. As a result of such dialogues a hundred or more people join the Party after a lecture. In this way, Party branches rapidly double or even treble their membership. Another method, used in the Basque Country, is "long table" dinners at which social and political problems are discussed, with Communists explaining their policy and inviting the "diners" to join the Party. This method has proved highly effective.

Mention should be made of the example of 150 labour (Workers' Commission) leaders

of Catalonia, who have publicly revealed their membership of the United Socialist Party of Catalonia and called on the working people of that Spanish province to join the Catalan Communists' party.

To raise the Party's strength to 300,000, it is not enough to use the above methods. If we are to reach this target, every Party member should show initiative and use all his possibilities. He should feel that he is an organiser capable of taking steps of his own in addition to those recommended by the committee of his Party group or by higher bodies. The task is not only to expand our political, theoretical and organising work among the masses, but to improve its standard. This will be achieved to the extent that our Party members go into the problems and preoccupations of workers in the enterprises, of men and women on neighbourhood committees, of peasants, intellectuals and members of liberal professions, campaigning for their particular demands, of young people who insist on their right to take an active part in national life. To this we must add the need to appreciate and support the aspirations of the various ethnic groups and regions which a bureaucratic centralist system brutally suppressed under Franco. The CPS regards the struggle for the rights and freedoms of these groups and regions as part of the struggle for democracy.

While doing our best to acquaint the masses with our policies and decisions, we must at the same time seek the co-operation of those who can help to fulfil these tasks. Many of the democratic-minded people invited to Party meetings or mass rallies are themselves capable of presenting our policy at lectures, seminars, meetings, etc. We are bringing in new cadres and training them, but we must also make our propaganda more flexible and up-to-date. We must end narrow-mindedness and sectariaaism where they persist and the erroneous notion that no one can do things better than we. Our motto is to proceed more boldly and show greater confidence in those who are willing to meet us half-way, seeing this as a possibility of correctly channelling their aspirations to fight for freedom, democracy and socialism.

Bearing these tasks in mind, the recent meeting of our Central Committee (held in Rome) decided to increase the CC membership on the understanding that every member should have a specific task, be directly linked with the organisations of his region and be responsible at his workplace for creative implementation of our policy.

As early as the period of the national revolutionary war, our Party demonstrated its capacity for organisation and mobilisation by working in all mass movements and in army units, by operating on both the war and home front. It demonstrated this by taking an active part in the political and educational effort, and in the work of labour centres. Now that the task is to win freedom by peaceful means, the Party is searching for new, flexible forms of organisation making it possible for working people all over the country who are fighting for democracy to join the Party.

The CC meeting pointed out that the Party card can be a means of establishing close links with people who accept our programme and policy. Accordingly, it decided to introduce a Party card and issue it to every Party member and to all who identify themselves with the Communists, thereby virtually becoming members.

In the period of transition from dictatorship to democracy and from illegality to legality, it is indispensable to use new forms of organisation enabling whoever subscribes to the programme and policy of the Party to participate in Party life and activity. We do not plan to create a party composed exclusively of activists. We realise that at first there will be those who will join the CPS merely because they accept its policies and principles; they will be issued a Party card, pay membership dues and attend meetings, probably no more than once a month. But we also know that every supporter of the Party is its potential member or activist. Many a person becomes one by operating on a Workers' Commission or neighbourhood committee or by performing other functions.

The CC also decided to move on from small, "invisible", clandestine cells to the formation of Communist groups that will meet to discuss political problems. These groups, in turn, can be subdivided into groups operating at workplace—on the shop floor,

in office departments or university faculties. Group meetings would also examine specif[ic] problems of the collectives concerned.

The decisions of the CC meeting are being carried out. *In particular, the Madrid Part[y] organisation has committed itself to treble its numerical strength and raise it to 30,000 b[y]* late 1976. It has already admitted 4,500 new members. The Communist Party of th[e] Basque Country, which has over 5,000 members, has pledged itself to increase it[s] membership to 20,000 by the year's end. In Valencia, the Party membership has alread[y] doubled.

Without citing any further examples, of which there are many, for the movemen[t] involves the whole country, we can confidently predict that our Part[y] membership—100,000—will reach and exceed 300,000 in the near future.

That will be both a quantitative and a qualitative growth, for the new people joining th[e] Party have experience of struggle and are inseparably linked with the working class an[d] other working people, that inexhaustible source of activity at meetings, in demonstration[s] and strikes, during which hundreds of thousands of working men and women an[d] members of other sections of the population take to the streets. The CPS joins in thes[e] actions. Communists of diverse nationalities of Spain make common cause with othe[r] opposition forces in Democratic Co-ordination and Co-ordination of Trade Unio[n] Forces (Workers' Commissions, the General Union of Working People and th[e] Federation of Labour Unions). It is important to note that the relations of anti-Franco anti-reformist unity are indicative of the recognition by other political forces, not only o[f] our power and influence, but of our right to play in multinational Spanish society the rol[e] we are entitled to under democratic rules, the legitimate right of yet another democrati[c] party to take part in the struggle for new and larger "freedom zones", for genuin[e] democracy in Spain.

[1] See *WMR*, April, June, July, November and December 1976.

[2] As the struggle goes on there develop conditions that constitute definite gains in regard to th[e] *right of assembly and demonstration. The democratic forms of activity that assert themselves as [a]* result, while lacking official authorisation, are not banned, either. This is what we call "freedo[m] zones".

Why we are with the Communists

This is the first of a series of interviews with new Party members and supporters. The ide[a] is to get people of different social status, different nationality, different age to explai[n] "Why we are with the Communists". The answers, we believe, will provide a bette[r] understanding of the role of the Marxist-Leninist Party in today's society and will sho[w] what features of the Party attract people, raise the Party's prestige and bring new recruits.

In this first interview, our correspondents questioned several members and supporte[rs] of the Communist Party of Finland.

EINO KILPI

Helsinki Shipyard Worker

I CAME to Helsinki from the North in 1967 and got a job at the shipyards. Things we[re] hard at first—they probably are for every newcomer to a big city and a big industry. I ha[d] trouble in finding a flat and things were not going too well on the job either. The first t[o] come to my aid, and not only with advice, were Communists. I watched them at wor[k,] listened to their views on questions that were being hotly discussed among the worker[s.] Gradually I made friends with some of the Communists and began to support them. Bu[t I] had the feeling that I could no longer remain on the sidelines—I wanted to be where th[e] action was. And so in 1972 I joined the Party. I think many workers, especiall[y]

newcomers, are mainly attracted by its ability to understand, express and uphold the vital interests of the working man.

Now that I have had some experience of practical work and know more about the Communist programme and aims, I can say that in joining the Party you begin to see things in a different light. Looking back on my own life, I recall how from early childhood we were trained in a spirit of "national boundaries", constantly told to stick to national customs and habits. That was the boundary, beyond it was another life, another society, with which we had nothing in common and much that separated us. But as a Communist one learns that there is very much in common.

At the Sirola School (a popular school of Marxist social science) I took up the history of the international Communist movement and came to see myself as a participant in the great world-wide struggle. Working on my examination paper on fascism, I became deeply convinced that the workers of all countries are fighting a common struggle for common aims. For us Communists this is the main content of our life.

TURO BERGMAN

Staff member, Labour Economic Research Institute

IT took some time for the decision to join the Communist Party to mature. My work at the Institute brought me into contact with many of the evils of present society. My reading of Marxist literature led me to realise that there was a scientific explanation of society and how it could be changed. When I felt that I was adequately prepared theoretically, I decided to join the Communist Party. The crucial factor in that decision was that the Party's scientific theory accorded with my own views.

I think that being a Communist means, above all, being guided by internal conviction. I know that I could not have that conviction as a member of any other party. For instance, the Social-Democrats' biggest shortcoming is that they do not have a firm scientific basis. They do at times pursue progressive policies, using one or another element of theory, but out of context and interaction with other elements. But theory is a single whole and such piecemeal application is bound to tell on practice—no wonder the Social-Democrats zig-zag from one position to another.

We now have a co-operation programme of the democratic forces involving the trade unions and other progressive mass organisations. But if the programme is to be successful, if we are to solve all the problems listed in it, there must be a vanguard force capable of assuming the main responsibility. And there is such a force, the Communist Party. Its strength lies in its theory, which unites people, gives them a comprehensive understanding of the world and directs their efforts towards our ultimate goal.

LEENA HIRVONEN

Clerk in a Wholesale Firm

MY political life began in 1972 when I joined the trade union. And my work in the union led to my joining the Communist Party.

Why did I decide to join? I belong to the Office Workers' Union and from my own observations I could see that its activities were haphazard. And this at a time when organisation was especially needed, for the position of workers in the clerical and other trades has changed visibly. Yet trade union activity—absolutely essential, of course—does not rest on a solid ideological basis, without which there can be no real struggle. I found such a basis in the Communist Party.

Its struggle is never confined to current demands. Reflecting on what induced me to join the Communist Party, I would say it was its programme, its ultimate aim, and the way the Communists set about resolving vital problems. I can't really separate one from the other, for in practice the two form a single whole. And in this, I think, lies the strength of the Communists.

A Communist—and I have come to know many—is a realist: people believe in him, they know they can rely on him. A Communist is an ordinary person, of course, but one more

exacting to himself. At any rate, that applies to most Party members. Naturally, this pla; a definite role in shaping one's impression of the Party as a whole. But its prestige, I a convinced, is determined above all by the fact that it gives everyone a new perspectiv This makes day-to-day work more meaningful and its results more important. I ha learnt that from my own experience.

OLAVI KOIVUNEN

Tool maker

WHY do I vote Communist? I am a worker and the Communists are the most articula representatives of the workers. If you take the Social-Democrats, say, you cannot alwa understand whose interests they are defending and what they're really after. There is ev the joke that if someone "has to be led by the nose" the assignment will go to a Soci Democrat. At times it would seem that they understand the employers better than t workers. But the Communists are always clear and consistent. No wonder some of o Social-Democrat workers trust them more than their own party functionaries.

I might be asked: if I have such a high opinion of the Communists, why don't I join t Party? As far as I can judge from my own impressions, being a Communist means bei very active. At any rate, the Communists at the plants where I worked were always t most active. But I know that I can't be active, both because of my temperament a because I have to spend so much time working, and there is no time left for anything else.

EKATERINA NIKKILÄ

University Instructor

LIKE most people, teachers and students have come to take a closer interest in public li Uppermost in our minds are such things as peace and international solidarity, ju solution of the problems of employment, education, public health and social welfare. A from my own observations, it is the Communists that are consistently working for the solution. Their programme fully accords with the interests and aspirations of the peop That is why I always support the Communists.

I would like to join the Party so as to come out of my shell and lead a more active li have a share in public affairs, and thus be of some help to others. I know ma Communists and can see that this is the kind of life they lead. But, frankly, I am being he back by this one consideration: there is still no full unity in the Party. Maybe Pa members take a different view of this, but looking at it from outside I think it hampers t struggle for solution of vital problems.

* * *

World Marxist Review invites letters from Communists and supporters on "Why I A With the Communists" for publication in the journal. Letters should be address Thakurova 3, Prague 6, Czechoslovakia.

Material Basis of the Socialist Community

PAUL VERNER
Political Bureau member and Secretary, CC SUPG

THE latest Party congresses of the CMEA countries, including the Ninth Congress of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany (May 1976), have shown that closer economic integration is a key development trend of world socialism. Economic interlocking of the CMEA countries began in 1971 with the adoption of the Comprehensive Socialist Economic Integration Programme. It paved the way for the dynamic growth of our countries and made for fuller use of the objective economic laws of socialism and its advantages by each country and the community as a whole. Co-operation in science and production helps the socialist nations to draw closer together in every sphere.

Implementation of the Comprehensive Programme has given the CMEA countries a more mature pattern of mutual economic and political relations. This was facilitated by their common position on all fundamental aspects of the theory and practice of building socialism and communism. The tasks facing them now are essentially similar or even identical, which makes it easier to accomplish them through joint effort, by pooling material and intellectual resources and using them on a larger scale and more effectively for the benefit of each people and in the interests of the entire socialist community. L. I. Brezhnev, General Secretary of the CC CPSU, defined this connection in his report to the 25th CPSU Congress, "The ties between socialist countries," he said, "are becoming ever closer with the flowering of each socialist nation and the strengthening of their sovereignty, and elements of community are increasing in their policy, economy, and public life. There is a gradual levelling up of their development. This process of a gradual drawing together of socialist countries is now operating quite definitely as an objective law."

All the party congresses noted that socialism has strengthened its positions in the economic competition with capitalism since the Comprehensive Programme was adopted. This is due in decisive measure to the increasingly close systematic all-round, co-operation among the CMEA countries according to plan. The results of their peoples' devoted effort can be seen in rapid economic growth and new social achievements.

The CMEA countries have become one of the world's largest dynamically developing economic areas. In the historically short span of a quarter-century, their share in world industrial production has doubled. With a population approximating to 10 per cent of the world's and to 19 per cent of the territory of the globe, they supply almost 34 per cent of the world's industrial output.

The changes in favour of socialism that are continuously taking place in the balance of forces are due primarily to the tremendous achievements of the Soviet Union in building the material and technical basis of communism. It accounts for over two-thirds of the CMEA economic potential. The remarkable, and continuing, progress that has been made in this century would have been unthinkable without the strengthening of the Soviet Union.

The people of the GDR have contributed their share to the development of the socialist community. The progress made by the republic in the past five years, and summed up by the Ninth SUPG Congress, is evidence of the increased stability and prestige of our state, of its growing economic strength and of a tangible improvement in the people's living and cultural standards. By putting the decisions of the Eighth Party Congress into practice, more was achieved in that period than under any of the earlier five-year plans.[1]

An analysis of these gains will show that in recent [illegible] has b
most closely linked with tighter economic integration. There are [illegible] of t
in particular the fact that our exports to CMEA countries have [illegible] faster t
our industrial output, with the share of *specialised products* increasing in both expo
and imports.

Due to advances in the division of labour and in co-operation in science a
production, trade with CMEA countries since the Eighth Party Congress rose by 83
cent, reaching 70 per cent of the republic's overall foreign trade, which in 1975 stood
more than 10,000m. roubles, or more than the figure for the entire 1956-60 period.

To a greater extent than with any other country, the GDR is linked economically w
the Soviet Union, the main force of world socialism and our chief partner in promot
fraternal co-operation among the CMEA countries. The more than 90 agreeme
signed by our two countries at government or ministerial level form the basis of
increasingly close intertwining of our economies. One-third of them are long-term one

In October 1975, the close alliance between the GDR and the Soviet Union w
reaffirmed by the conclusion of the Treaty of Friendship, Co-operation and Mutu
Assistance which opened up new vistas for our joint activity. Article 2 of the treaty rea
"*The High Contracting Parties shall join efforts to make effective use of the material a*
intellectual potentials of their peoples and states with a view to building socialist a
communist society and to strengthening the socialist community. In accordance with t
principles and objectives of socialist economic integration and for the purpose of meeti
the material and cultural requirements of their peoples more effectively, they sh
strengthen and expand mutually beneficial bilateral and multilateral economic, scienti
and technological co-operation, in particular within the framework of the Council f
Mutual Economic Assistance." *This amounts to a vast programme for growing all-rou*
co-operation and fraternal mutual assistance.

The meeting which Erich Honecker, General Secretary of the CC SUPG, and Leoni
Brezhnev, General Secretary of the CC CPSU, held in the Crimea in August 197
proceeded in the same spirit. It concentrated on steps to further relations between the tw
brother countries in every sphere.

The Soviet Union will continue to hold a leading place in the foreign trade of the GDR
which, in turn, holds first place in Soviet foreign trade.

We are importing more sophisticated technology from the USSR. In fact we hav
retooled whole industries, such as power engineering, with Soviet aid. Of the 5,700m
marks invested by us in 1971-75 in the power industry, roughly one-third was spent o
plant imported from the Soviet Union.

Soviet deliveries meet a substantial part of our demand for raw materials, machiner
and plant. The consumer items we import from the Soviet Union add to the variety of ou
goods. Our exports to the Soviet Union help it expand production of raw materials an
fuel and provide it with certain types of machines, instruments and plant. In recent year
we have considerably increased our consumer goods exports to the Soviet Union.

New forms of co-operation are developing as mutual relations grow stronger. Th
GDR, like other fraternal countries, takes a direct part in the development of raw materia
and fuel deposits in the Soviet Union. Major joint projects include the Ust Ilim cellulos
complex, the Kiyembai asbestos complex and a gas pipeline running from Orenburg to th
western frontier of the Soviet Union.

Co-operation between the GDR and Soviet Union encompasses all economic fields an
plays a particularly important role in the advancement of science and technology. A
present, 80 per cent of all state plan assignments in science and technology involv
collaboration with Soviet organisations. As a result, the GDR, which cannot work i
every field of science or technology simultaneously because its material and manpowe
resources are limited, has access to the scientific and technological achievements of th
Soviet Union and can concentrate on aspects of the scientific and technological revolutio
that are more in keeping with our economic pattern and possibilities.

An indication of the fruitfulness of this co-operation was the Soviet Soyuz 22 space xperiment. The successful use in the experiment of the multizone MKF6 camera made by ur state-owned Carl Zeiss firm is evidence of the fruitfulness of the collective effort of the wo countries. Erich Honecker spoke highly of this example of close co-operation, which ;d to a major scientific achievement.

This combination of the scientific potentials of the GDR and Soviet Union greatly enefits both countries. Also gaining in importance are such forms of co-operation as ›int research (there are already 30 teams) and joint designing.

Bilateral agreements between the two countries are supplemented by multilateral greements in various fields of scientific and technological co-operation, which likewise ɔntribute to our country's potential. The GDR is participating, as a CMEA member, in 4 co-ordinating centres working on highly important complex problems.

Our Party and people appreciate the contribution which the CPSU, the Soviet overnment, the working class and other working people of the Soviet Union make to ocialist economic integration. We see this as a further expression of the internationalism f the CPSU and the Soviet Union as a whole, of their sustained effort to build up the olitical and economic might of socialism and of each socialist country.

Our people regard the 25th CPSU Congress guidelines for laying the material and chnical foundations of communism as an earnest of closer socialist economic ntegration.

Bourgeois ideologists, deliberately misrepresenting the facts, accuse the Soviet Union f "abusing" its economic power in the integration process. Accustomed as they are to inking in capitalist economic terms, they blame the Soviet Union for securing milateral" advantages at its partners' expense.

The GDR has been co-operating with the Soviet Union for more than 30 years. Our experience disproves those anti-communist accusations. The close interlocking of the national economies of the socialist community is of immense benefit to all participants. Integration processes under socialism follow the principles of equality and deep respect for the interests of each country. This stems from a common ideology, Marxism-Leninism, and common socio-economic foundations In these circumstances, fraternal co-operation in every field is a prerequisite of economic and social progress.

We have every reason to say that we have made appreciable progress. It is obvious, however, that we will have to make still greater and better use of the opportunities afforded by fraternal co-operation.

The Party congresses carefully evaluated achievements and decided on further steps to attain their common goals. That is blue-printed in the important decisions adopted by the 30th CMEA Session (Berlin, July 1976). They envisage, first of all, the drafting of specific long-term programmes for the solution of important economic problems in the next 10 to 15 years. This will assure the CMEA countries continued dynamic economic growth.

Our Party's activities are invariably based on the principle that close interaction with the Soviet Union and other CMEA countries is a decisive condition for the economic and social progress of our republic. This will also determine our future line. "We are firmly convinced," said Erich Honecker at the Ninth SUPG Congress, "that the further strengthening and deepening of socialist economic integration will become, to a still greater degree than in the past, a decisive prerequisite of the steady and planned development of our and other socialist countries." This statement specifies the main line of our Party's effort in the given sphere.

In the current five-year period, our Party sets higher targets than in the previous five years. The new social and political programme continues the line of steadily raising the people's living and cultural standards. We realise that these tasks can only be fulfilled in close alliance with the countries of the socialist community. This is why the targets approved by the Ninth Party Congress for 1976-80 are based on plans co-ordinated with the Soviet Union and other CMEA countries. We specified the main imports needed to carry out our plan and long-term exports to the Soviet Union and other CMEA countries.

The task now is to systematically implement the agreements reached, including the or on exports and imports. With the ever closer interlocking of the CMEA countrie economies, the internationalist responsibility of each country increases, for national plan include also export commitments—other countries' plans are tied to prompt deliverie from their partners.

Accordingly, we consider it very important to meet our republic's commitments especially those arising from its participation in projects on the territory of the Sovie Union or other CMEA countries, whose purpose is to increase our common supply of raw materials and fuel. Developing new raw material and fuel deposits requires ever greater outlays. It is only natural that all members of the socialist community take part in major projects of this nature, which include joint geological survey, co-operation in research, and direct investments in mining and drilling capacities and in transport.

In the current five-year period, under treaties signed with CMEA countries, the GDR will, as a participant in investments, supply machinery, plant and materials worth from 7,000m. to 8,000m. marks. This calls for higher labour productivity in heavy machine-building, chemical and electrical engineering, electronics and other industries. How this will pay off can be seen from these figures: Soviet deliveries to the GDR in 1976-80 will comprise 88.2 million tons of oil, 21,600 million cubic metres of natural gas, 15.9 million tons of rolled ferrous metals and 375,000 tons of cellulose.

The economic development guidelines for 1976-80 envisage notable advances in production specialisation and co-ordination with the Soviet Union and other CMEA countries. This will play a big role in intensifying the economy by laying a durable groundwork for quantity production and, consequently, for higher effectiveness.

We are buying more specialised goods. The growing production potential of the CMEA countries in machinery, chemicals, electrical engineering and electronics creates opportunities for fuller use of the advantages of international division of labour and international co-operation. Our demand for basic plant for thermal and atomic power stations, powerful diesel locomotives, heavy tractors, tramcars and buses is being met by deliveries from the Soviet Union and other CMEA countries. Machinery imports from the Soviet Union in the 1976-80 period will increase by more than 80 per cent. Nearly half of reciprocal deliveries of these items, are stipulated by long-term specialisation agreements. This helps to continue intensifying production and make concentrated use of the republic's research and production capacities in carrying out economic assignments.

Growing production specialisation, co-ordination and concentration, for all their economic benefits, have never been an end in themselves. The primary purpose is to meet the country's requirements more effectively and improve its export opportunities. This makes them an important basis for the planned expansion of foreign economic relations including relations with developed capitalist and developing countries.

Increasing specialisation and co-ordination should help to produce high-standard items attractive to the buyer, which is the basis for lasting long-range export relations And we must work for ever higher standards. That is the only way to make full use of the advantages of socialist co-operation, which has proved its value to all our countries.

Science and technology today are the main factor in raising productivity. To accomplish the tasks facing us in this sphere, our scientific and technological potential must interact still more closely with those of the Soviet Union and other CMEA countries This is the shortest and best road to attaining the potential we need, achieving serious results in science and technology and putting them to use.

Rapid scientific and technological progress makes it ever more imperative for big research teams to co-operate on a multilateral and planned basis. Accordingly, besides co-ordinating their economic plans for 1976-80, the CMEA countries drew up, for the first time, a comprehensive plan for the development of science and technology. It specifies the more imortant problems which ministries, research institutes and economic combines will jointly solve by 1980. The list includes fundamental research in power, coal and chemicals chemical engineering, electronics, machine-tools, construction and building materials.

Thus, direct co-ordinated co-operation in research will expand considerably by 1980. Exchanges of research findings will be increasingly complemented by joint work on major economic problems.

To achieve the highest possible economic effectiveness, research and production must be brought still closer together. Now as never before, it is important to ensure that the results of research and designing are quickly and effectively applied in production. This means that as early as the stage of research and designing, it is necessary to take into account the long-range production requirements, primarily future specialisation and co-operation measures that can steeply increase efficiency.

Bearing in mind the need to strengthen the socialist community, we attach great political and economic significance to the drafting of the specific long-term programmes mentioned earlier. These envisage long-range measures to solve raw material, fuel and power problems, improve the supply of highly efficient machinery and plant, develop agriculture and transport and increase consumer goods production to meet the growing demand. In other words, the plans are aimed at solving problems on whose solution the further progress of each CMEA country and the socialist community as a whole largely depend.

These programmes carry forward the general line of co-operation in planning laid down in the Comprehensive Programme. This co-operation is the principal method of furthering the socialist division of labour and co-operation in production. By drawing up these programmes, the brother countries have for the first time gone beyond co-ordination for a five-year period and set out to co-ordinate their efforts in achieving long-range objectives. This provides a new basis for long-term planning. Now that we are doing this, we can take account of all growth factors in the increasingly close intertwining of the CMEA countries' economies. This is also important politically, for it demonstrates the advantages of the socialist economic and social system.

In these conditions, demands in regard to the work and co-operation of planning agencies are mounting, for elaboration of a common strategy should be closely linked with the drafting of five-year and annual economic plans. This is the first time we have had to solve such long-term overall planning problems. And their solution requires that government and economic bodies show a high degree of responsibility and competence.

The fact that we can now set ourselves such ambitious tasks and look far ahead is a sign of the advanced relations between socialist countries. The domination of socialist production relations, the high development level of the productive forces achieved by all CMEA countries, and a common world outlook based on Marxist-Leninist theory, provide the objective prerequisites of solving major problems jointly and effectively.

The latest meeting of the Political Consultative Committee of the Warsaw Treaty countries (Bucharest November 1976) stressed the brother countries' determination to continue "developing bilateral and multilateral co-operation in every economic field, in the utilisation of scientific and technological achievements, to bring about a further improvement in their peoples' living and cultural standards, contributing in common with other CMEA member countries to the growing materialisation of the Comprehensive Programme and to the execution of the decisions of the 30th CMEA Session concerning the joint drafting and implementation of specific long-term programmes." Growing co-operation among the member countries will undoubtedly enhance the international prestige of the CMEA and the appeal of its example.

We are well prepared to fulfil socialist economic integration tasks. The Ninth SUPG Congress specified the next steps to be taken in this direction. The Second Plenum of the CC SUPG (September 1976) summed up the results achieved by the country since the congress. We noted with satisfaction that the republic's stable and steady development continues. In spite of certain difficulties due to unfavourable weather conditions that told above all on farming, we are making good headway in carrying out plan assignments for 1976. This also applies to scientific and technological progress, a key factor for continued economic growth. Speaking at the plenum, Erich Honecker pointed once again to the

important role of the CMEA countries' co-operation in research and production aimed at speeding scientific and technological progress.

Our Party devotes and will continue devoting the closest attention to this matter and, in general, to the fulfilment of commitments. This means that we will honour our pledge to the Ninth Congress to ensure that the GDR unfailingly contributes its share to closer economic, scientific and technological co-operation among the fraternal socialist countries.

[1] The achievements of the GDR between the two congresses have been described in detail by Werner Lamberz, Kurt Hager and Harry Tisch (see *WMR* July, September and November 1976.—*Ed.*)

Will of the Unsubdued People of Cyprus

EZEKIAS PAPAIOANNOU
General Secretary, Progressive Party of the Working People of Cyprus (AKEL)

THE situation in Cyprus after the dramatic events of July 1974[1] objectively helped the formation—at least in that part of the country ruled by the lawful government of President Makarios—of a new socio-economic relationship, creating conditions for establishing and strengthening co-operation of all patriotic and democratic elements in the struggle against reaction and imperialism.

On the social level this co-operation embraces not only such traditional allies as the workers and peasants, but also progressive intellectuals, patriotic elements of the national and petty bourgeoisie. Politically, it extends to the democratic parties, trade unions and peasant organisations that support the government and its patriotic course.

Last year's September 5 elections were a concrete and convincing illustration of the positive changes that had taken place in the political situation. Their results are particularly important.

Two lines clashed during the September elections—the anti-imperialist line of liberation struggle for the independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of Cyprus, and a non-aligned policy, the island's demilitarisation and a settlement of the Cyprus issue within the framework and on the basis of UN resolutions. This was the line followed by three parties co-operating on this basis during the election campaign—the working-class party, AKEL, the newly established Democratic Front Party headed by former Foreign Minister Spyros Kyprianou, and the socialist Unified Democratic Union of the Centre Party (EDEK) headed by Vassos Lyssarides.

The other was the line of capitulation, of acceptance in effect, of the situation caused by the aggression against Cyprus, seeking a settlement for Cyprus within the framework and in the interests of the imperialist NATO bloc. This was the course of the "Democratic Alarm" an extreme right-wing coalition formed by Glavkos Clerides—former President of Parliament. With the extreme right also was the fascist EOKA-2[2] organisation.

AKEL, the oldest and strongest party in Cyprus, which last year marked its 50th anniversary, played the central role in organising the union of three democratic parties and mobilising the people in support of its programme.

The Third Plenum of the AKEL Central Committee clearly outlined the Party's election tasks: "Co-operation with all democratic, patriotic, anti-imperialist and anti-putschist political forces supporting President Makarios's policy, working to purge the state machinery of putschists, prepared for a common struggle for a just, peaceful and democratic settlement acceptable to our people as a whole. Guided by the interests of our

people in their severe and difficult battle, the Party will participate in the elections not t attain political hegemony, but to strengthen the union of all healthy and active patrioti forces, unite them around our country's democratic and patriotic political leadershi headed by President Makarios. Our Party will work for a new Parliament which woul express the genuine aspirations of our country's sound, consistently patriotic an democratic forces".

AKEL's campaign slogans reflected the interests of all our people, Greek-Cypriot Turkish-Cypriots, Armenians and Maronites,[3] of all patriotic-minded social strata However, it was no simple task to achieve co-operation of the three democratic parties a the elections. And to this end, AKEL agreed to all reasonable concessions, seeking t achieve the broader political goals as stipulated in the decisions of its Central Committee Despite the furious campaign launched against it by the reactionaries, despite th malicious anti-Communist propaganda and cries of a "red danger" the people of Cypru showed their trust in AKEL and its allies and strongly condemned those who called for change in the country's policy in the interests of the imperialist monopolies and the NAT(countries.

As is known, the parties of patriotic and democratic co-operation won the elections obtaining close to 75 per cent of the votes and all 35 seats allotted to Greek-Cypriots in th House of Representatives. The remaining 15 seats, under the Constitution, belong t Turkish-Cypriots. But they walked out of the House in 1963 and to this day have no returned.

By prior agreement of the three parties, 21 seats went to the Democratic Front, 9 t AKEL and 4 to EDEK. The remaining seat was given to the Greek-Cypriot representativ at the inter-communal negotiations, Tassos Papadopoulos, an independent.

AKEL, which in the previous Parliament had nine seats, could have won many mor had it acted independently. It preferred, however, to restrict itself to 9 in the interests of co operation during the elections with the other democratic parties. This made possible th isolation and crushing defeat of the extreme right and fascist forces.

The "Democratic Alarm" accounted for about 24 per cent of the votes, but due to th "majority" electoral system, and because of the overwhelming superiority of the three co operating democratic parties, it was left with no seats.

By their vote the unsubdued people of Cyprus made absolutely clear their rejection c all those responsible for their suffering, for their tragic fate. The House c Representatives, now cleansed of avowedly rightist and pro-NATO elements, is mor democratic.

The election victory of the democratic, progressive and anti-imperialist forces i important not only to Cyprus and its liberation struggle, but for the entire region of th East Mediterranean and the Middle East. For since the cold war days, imperialism particularly US imperialism, has been conducting subversive activities in Cyprus t influence a "settlement" of the Cyprus problem in its own interests and turn the island int an air force and rocket base to control this region. And these activities were stepped u after independence was proclaimed in 1960.

Imperialism could not accept the existence of an independent, non-aligned state with strong working-class party—AKEL—in the East Mediterranean, and the US rulin circles devised and launched their notorious Acheson Plan to split Cyprus and turn it int their operational base. This was to be accomplished by neutralising President Makaric and AKEL, for the authors of this plan were well aware that they were their greate obstacle. In its anti-Cyprus policy US imperialism co-operated closely with Britis imperialism which has bases in Cyprus, and with its accomplices in Turkey and Greec

The CIA, that criminal US spy organisation, spent millions of dollars on ant Communist activities in Cyprus and on preparing the July 15, 1974, fascist putsc (according to CIA agent Hafner, 60 million dollars were spent in 1973-74 alone). It ha been reliably established that the CIA and US imperialism inspired the junta military cou and the Turkish invasion.

In 1956, the MPLA was founded. That gave the Angolan people's will for national independence precise political and organisational shape. However, it not only provided new opportunities to foster our co-operation with Portugal's democrats but created certain problems. The point is that there was no unity of views in the Portuguese democratic movement on the future of the colonies.

Q. In other words, not all those who were against the fascist dictatorship were for granting freedom to the colonies?

A. Not all by far, especially in the early period when a broad democratic opposition to the Salazar regime was only just in the making.

In those conditions, an event occurred which played a tremendous part in the growth of the revolutionary struggle in both Portugal and its colonies. The Fifth Congress of the Portuguese Communist Party made a statement recognising without qualification the colonial people's right to immediate and full independence. To make such a statement in the atmosphere of 1957 was to show uncommon courage. After all, it is a fact that no other party or anti-fascist force could bring itself to do as much.

Afterwards, numerous democrats adopted a similar position but they did so only afterwards and only under the influence of the Communist example. Anti-colonialist ideas began gradually to win recognition among the most diverse social strata and political circles of Portugal and gained much ground among the students. Many of the students who were called up undertook to spread these ideas among the troops. Due largely to their effort, colonialist and militarist tendencies in the armed forces were defeated.

In 1969, the colonies' right to freedom was recognised by the Aveiro congress of the Portuguese democratic opposition. Indeed, the Caetano government was no longer in a position to ban the congress or prevent it from passing anti-colonialist resolutions.

Be that as it may, I must stress that the Communists' initiative played a decisive role in that awakening. The Portuguese people owe it primarily to the PCP that they grasped the meaning of the colonial problem and came near seeing the only workable way to solve it.

This is why, leaning on the solidarity of Portugal's democrats in our liberation struggle, we always remembered that the Communists were our staunchest and most consistent friends. If there was general democratic solidarity on the part of the Portuguese with the peoples fighting for liberation from colonial bondage, the pivot around which it took shape was the thoroughly internationalist position of the party of the Portuguese working class.

Incidentally, genuine internationalism at times implies readiness to risk certain temporary political reverses in the interest of the main strategic line. The PCP did risk that in 1957, for there was no guarantee that other anti-fascists and democrats would respond to its initiative, that it would not be misunderstood and find itself all alone with its far-reaching appeals. It is obvious now that subsequent events justified the step and showed it to be principled and hence far-sighted.

Q. Do you mean the events of April 25, 1974, and later?

A. Yes. But I must point out again that even in the new conditions created by the overthrow of the fascist dictatorship, co-operation between Portugal's democrats and the freedom fighters of the colonies was rather a complicated process. Sometimes there was no mutual understanding, let alone co-operation. This was true above all of Angola.

Indeed, Lisbon's official policy towards Angola as distinct from other colonies was aimed, even after April 25, at preventing full national independence. The first provisional government appointed Silvino Silverio Marques governor of Angola. He had held the post earlier, under Salazar, and his reinstatement was marked by brutal punitive measures and massacres.

It was not until after vigorous action by the Angolans, including a series of impressive demonstrations, that Lisbon removed Marques. The post went to Admiral Alba Rosa Coutinho. He was a democrat and played an essentially positive role. But he couldn't do much. He was resisted by both a substantial part of the army and reactionary Portuguese settlers. When a transitional government of Angola was formed leaders of the FNLA and

UNITA insisted on Coutinho's resignation. His functions were assumed by General Silva Cardoso, made High Commissioner.

A very hard period followed. Many people still wonder who was in charge in Angola at the time or what the transitional government's policy was. But surely all talk about government or policy is irrelevant in this case. The government as such was, in effect, unable to provide any leadership because the FNLA and UNITA men in it did nothing but plunder the country through the ministries they controlled. It was monstrous. Those were real gangsters with ministers' portfolios. The limit was certainly reached when, one day, the FNLA Minister of Health pulled up at a bank in a truck carrying troops and forcibly withdrew 100 million escudos. Nobody has seen the money, the truck, or the minister since. Much the same went on in the Ministry of Foreign Trade, headed by an FNLA man. If our country escaped an irreparable economic catastrophe, it was only because the Ministry of Finance was in MPLA hands.

Everybody knows what imperialism and home reaction were after in Angola from the spring of 1975 on. They planned to expel the MPLA from Luanda and seize the capital by November 11, the date fixed for the declaration of independence. I suppose I don't have to remind you of the general trend of events. The outcome is well known. But it may be useful from the point of view of the subject we are discussing to stress that throughout the period of struggle, which ended in the complete liberation of the country in March 1976, we were unfailingly backed and really aided by our traditional allies outside Angola.

We owe a debt of infinite gratitude to the Soviet Union and Cuba for their tremendous contribution to our victory. We will always single out and emphasise the role of the peoples of both socialist countries in our fight. But we are also deeply grateful to other friendly countries, such as the People's Republic of the Congo and the Guinean Republic, which have a lesser capability but did all in their power to identify themselves effectively with Angola's patriots.

As regards Portugal—and I mean the new Portugal which by then had travelled a road 18 months long (after April 25)—the social and political antagonisms of Portuguese society and the Portuguese revolution, and hence serious differences in the attitude to us and to the goals of our fight, made themselves felt.

Let us not speak of the rightists, of those who, like the High Commissioner, Cardoso, refused on November 11 to surrender power in Luanda to the MPLA government. However, his attitude didn't matter any longer because power was in our hands anyway). The rightists' attitude was clear. But we also had to deal with influential political circles that represented Portuguese democracy and yet did not become our allies.

They may be said to have taken an intermediate and most hesitant stand. They didn't explicitly oppose the MPLA but advised us, for example, to merge with UNITA. They said UNITA was "better" than the FNLA. We argued in vain that there was no reason to prefer one group of imperialist puppets to another. In short, they didn't understand Angolan realities even though they tried to justify their vacillation and indecision by invoking "realism". They said we must be "realists" and so discard the illusion that the United States would allow Angola to be freed, hence it would be unrealistic to back the MPLA's struggle for full independence.

Why did Portugal's democrats—and we are speaking of the democrats, of course—talk and act in such a way as to play virtually into the hands of the enemies of our people's freedom? Precisely because they were democrats, not revolutionaries. This distinction stands out all the more when their attitude is compared with the policy and activity of the Portuguese Communists.

At the Eighth PCP Congress, we stressed again how very greatly free Angola values the firmness and consistency of Portugal's Communists, who invariably and most emphatically demanded recognition of the full sovereignty of our republic. We never forget that the Portuguese delegation which greeted us in Luanda on liberation day, November 11, was sent by the Portuguese Communist Party.

History repeated itself in a sense, for on that occasion, too, the PCP set an example

which other political forces of Portugal followed because they had to. Nor did that come at once. We had already been recognised by Sweden, Norway, Italy, France, Brazil—87 countries in all—and Portugal turned out to be the 88th state on the list.

Q. How are relations between the two countries shaping up now? What are the prospects? Angola still has no embassy in Lisbon, does it?

A. No, we really have no embassy here yet. But there's nothing political behind this. Portugal has an embassy in Luanda and as for us, we are simply short of trained personnel. This is one of the consequences of our colonial past.

On the whole, there's every opportunity now for the development of sound Angolan-Portuguese relations. We do all we can for them to be based on mutual respect, equality and non-interference.

Speaking of the prospects, they will certainly depend, among other things, on how well we achieve our aims in Angola and how the process of social change goes on in Portugal.

At the threshold of the first anniversary of independence, Angola confiscated the property of two major banks, the Bank of Angola and Commercial Bank of Angola. Two new banks, the National Bank of Angola and People's Bank of Angola, were founded instead. In this way, our people exercised their sovereign right to dispose of their own finances.

In deciding on the measure, we proceeded from Marx's and Lenin's ideas, from what they said about the importance of banks as levers of economic power which the revolution must not leave in private hands. The banks have also been nationalised in Portugal. It is a big revolutionary gain for its people. Obviously, these similarities in the development of the two countries strengthen, and will go on strengthening, the basis for their mutual understanding and co-operation.

However, we must fight if we want this co-operation really to assume vast proportions and bring both peoples the greatest benefits. The slogan of our movement, "The struggle is continuing", also applies to this field. And since the struggle is continuing, we again regard Portugal's Communists as our most loyal allies.

We speak a common language, both literally and politically. Both aspects of this reality are important. We must eliminate illiteracy, which affects 85 per cent of the population. Besides, the lack of trained personnel is an acute problem with us, as I've said. But in striving to give the people an education and special knowledge, we want their schooling to include the acquisition of a revolutionary political world outlook. And from whom do we get prompt aid, for example literature that doesn't have to be translated, or teachers who don't have to learn a foreign language? From Portugal's Communists, of course. We are now working to organise a steady flow to Angola of books and periodicals which are published by the PCP and treat from Marxist-Leninist positions problems of interest to our people.

Q. Does that also apply to the Portuguese edition of *Problems of Peace and Socialism?*

A. Certainly.

All in all, life has shown very clearly that the policy of proletarian internationalism, whose principles have been tested over decades of revolutionary practice, is a fruitful policy. This means that our internationalist alliance with the Portuguese Communist Party has always been and will remain the most dependable basis for the co-operation and interaction of all revolutionary and democratic forces of Portugal and Angola.

French Imperialism on the World Scene

MARTIN VERLET
Foreign Policy Department, CC French Communist Party

FINANCE capital has laid its imprint on widely different aspects of French life and foreign policy. But the monopoly system, the very essence of imperialism, is undergoing a long and all-embracing crisis. It affects the power structure and imperatively demands other, democratic and socialist policies and institutions. That is the meaning of the ever sharper class battles in France.

French imperialism has undergone deep change since the days when Lenin rightly exposed it as usurous, parasitic imperialism. The restructuring of French industry, chiefly manufacturing, begun in the 50s, was greatly stimulated by General de Gaulle's coming to power in 1958: by the close of 1972 industrial output had trebled; GNP has been growing at an annual average of 5.5 per cent; employment increased from 60 per cent of the active population in 1952 to 80 per cent in 1972. Industrial and financial concentration has been progressing apace: in 1970, 0.5 per cent of enterprises employing 38 per cent of industrial workers, accounted for 45 per cent of trade turnover and 68 per cent of investment. Economic concentration and reorganisation has gone hand in hand with internationalisation of production, trade and capital.

These changes are taking place against the background of the growing and all-embracing crisis which is weakening imperialism as a whole, contracting its sphere of influence and reducing its domination potential. Forced to retreat under pressure of continuing reverses and mounting difficulties, French imperialism is making an all-out effort to "regroup its forces" and adapt to the new conditions. The powerful offensive of socialism has pierced the system of imperialist domination, and imperialism has proved unable to fill the breach. France's vast colonial empire, the world's second biggest, with an oppressed population of 70 million in countries covering 12 million sq. kms., was destroyed by its insurgent peoples in Indochina and in North and Tropical Africa.

Centralisation and concentration of capital, as also its internationalisation, usually take the form of powerful multinational companies, whose activities are having an oppressive effect on the country's economic and public life. Though French imperialism is somewhat backward and has its structural defects, aggravated by the crisis, it cannot be described as a weak imperialism. France holds fifth place in the world in GNP and in 1973 advanced to third place in exports, sharing that position with Japan.

A tight group of financial monopolies have built up a veritable empire of their own. They did so by concentrating and channeling a massive amount of capital, ruining whole sectors of the productive apparatus in the process, pilfering the public exchequer and national wealth, breaking up the social structure of society.

French imperialism commands important political and military means to support the monopoly drive for domination and exploitation. France is a permanent member of the UN Security Council; the third biggest nuclear power, the only European capitalist country with a diversified strategic and tactical nuclear arsenal; the capitalist world's second biggest armaments merchant. Clinging to what remains of its colonial positions and imposing neocolonial domination on a number of countries, it has built military bases in the Pacific and Indian Oceans, Africa and the Caribbean, as links in imperialism's strategic system.

The financial oligarchy has its own political apparatus: a coterie of business tycoons and top government officials and an authoritarian centralised government capable of promoting its interests on all national and international issues.

Nor is that all, French imperialism is exploiting what is rightly the property of the entire

nation. France's industrial, technical and scientific base could help strengthen its independence by promoting co-operation with all countries. But imperialist policy, which has plunged the country into a crisis, in undermining that base.

In fact, expansion of the top French industrial and financial groups is the main goal of President Giscard d'Estaing's policy. The working people are combating that policy, for they have to carry the burden of the celebrated re-grouping policy. Hundreds of factories are closing; economic growth rates are slowing down; 1.4 million are unemployed and 700,000 teenagers are looking for work. On the other hand, whole branches of the economy have been thrown open to foreign capital. Indeed, some—computers, nuclear energy, high-quality steel—are all but owned by foreign interests. A number of industries are doomed, and yet factories are being transferred to other countries. Wage rises are being held back while inflation continues to grow. The people's purchasing power has declined, and 16 million are living on or below the official poverty line. The social services are getting far less than they need. Intransigence and repression seem to be the reply of the government and employers to the workers' demands. The government wants to impose an austerity economy, and a horrendous example of what is the Barre plan introduced in September 1976.

The new supranational orientation of French monopoly capital is being carried out against the background of sharper imperialist rivalry, on the one hand, and an intensified process of integration, on the other. This is expressive of capitalism's historical doom, of its *inability to solve the problems posed by the internationalisation and socialisation of* production. The methods it used to resolve the crisis are only exacerbating it, for they lead to the squandering of available means, inefficient use of the productive forces and irrational use of labour power. All this is leading to social degradation, jeopardising national independence and impeding international co-operation.

Export of goods and capital is being given top priority, while at the same time, the government is encouraging, indeed stimulating, the penetration of foreign capital, which now controls 6 per cent of industrial enterprises and accounts for 25 per cent of the trade turnover and of investment. One French worker in five is employed by a foreign-based international monopoly.

Though some French-based multinationals are becoming stronger, their links with foreign-based concerns are steadily increasing. The result is a close intertwining of capital, a new impetus for capitalist integration, particularly within the EEC, but also throughout the capitalist world.

French imperialism is trying to find a niche for itself under the wing of the most powerful imperialist states. The turn towards Atlanticism began in 1968-69 with concessions to the dollar, rapprochement with Bonn and the Nixon-de Gaulle talks, was carried further by Pompidou and sharpened all aspects of the crisis. The Giscard d'Estaing government, as our 22nd Party Congress emphasised, is fully committed to Atlanticism: "Giscard d'Estaing's international policy (the Congress declared) scrupulously follows the world strategy inspired and implemented by the United States. The fig-leaf of 'universal character of French policy' cannot hide the fact that this policy is nothing but a 'new Atlanticism'." It will thus be seen that the present government is one of the main motive factors in the policy of blocs and is placing our country and its economy in a dependent position. Of course, French imperialism encourages the ambitious plans of the French-based multinationals, but its actions do not go beyond the interests of imperialism as a whole. It plays an active part in strengthening the political, economic, social and military contacts between the main capitalist states, which find themselves obliged to restructure their international relations.

This policy is being operated at a time when imperialism is fully aware that its positions have been undermined. The imperialist system of domination is crumbling. The world is changing at an increasingly rapid pace. The forces of socialism are going from strength to strength. Today a third of the human race is building socialism, which has achieved a high level of social and economic development. Its military might is capable of administering a

fitting rebuff to the military forces of the capitalist countries. It is taking more and more peaceful initiatives. It is scoring new successes in the economic, scientific and technical fields.

Democratic demands are being pressed in all capitalist countries. Facism has been overthrown in Portugal and Greece and shaken in Spain. The peoples of the capitalist countries have become markedly more active, since the crisis affects every one of them. The struggle now unfolding against the more onerous consequences of the crisis is more frequently being directed against the system itself, against imperialism. The liberation movement is making impressive headway, as evidenced by the epochal victory of the peoples of Vietnam, Kampuchea and Laos over US imperialism. The liberation movement is acquiring a new quality with the growing and widely supported demand for economic emancipation. The changes in the international situation and the new relation of forces, which is to the disadvantage of imperialism and to the advantage of the peoples fighting for democracy and socialism, found expression at the Helsinki Conference

Such is the international situation in which the Giscard government is pursuing its foreign policy. It is trying the destinies of France to the new American strategy. Its first official act was the June 1974 declaration on the 25th anniversary of NATO (the so-called Ottawa Charter). It gives the United States the right to interfere in the affairs of Western Europe through "consultation" whenever a serious problem arises. Besides, it extends NATO's sphere of interference to regions not even mentioned in the 1949 NATO Treaty. The meetings on Martinique and at Rambouillet and Puerto Rico, the President's visit to Washington and his frequent talks with the Secretary of State are indicative of the close ties with Washington, formed, moreover, at a time when the US government is more than ever determined to play a dominant role. France is also facilitating NATO activity in many different fields, though it does not belong to the NATO military command.

To believe the present government, France's future, the guarantee of her independence, depends—besides close relations with the US—on the establishment of a united capitalist Europe.

"France's social and economic development is linked with progress in building Europe," says the official report on the 7th socio-economic plan. And by way of amplification, the president of the National Employers Council declares: "Europe, as it now exists, is of vital importance.... We are faced with the problem of Europe's political organisation, and I feel that there is no alternative to a European Union." And at a time when the European Economic Community is being shaken and disorganised by the continuing crisis, Giscard d'Estaing is out to accelerate its political integration. Towards that end he is campaigning for early elections to a supranational European parliament, though the EEC is becoming increasingly subject to West German imperialism, which is persistently pressing its claim to leadership. The Bonn government is doing everything to establish its political hegemony in capitalist Europe. Working in full agreement with US imperialism, it is using pressure tactics to influence the political evolution of the Mediterranean countries. More, it wants to impose on all EEC nations its demands in industry, finance, social policy and agriculture. It wants France to renounce its sovereignty, consent to political and social regress and suppress democracy.

The Giscard government relies heavily on its alliance with the most powerful imperialist states, the US and the FRG. It is also active in the Middle East, the Mediterranean and Africa, using its advantageous positions there to act as imperialism's vanguard. It is convening in Rambouillet what can only be described as a directorate of capitalist powers, enabling US imperialism to impose its concepts.

The class character of this policy is obvious. It highlights antagonism between the financial oligarchy, on the one hand, and democracy and growing socialism, on the other. It is a policy dictated by the financial oligarchy's fear of the growing desire of the young states to achieve unhampered political sovereignty and economic independence. It is imbued with fear of democracy, now hewing a way for itself in France, and of the changed alignment of forces which does not favour the financial oligarchy and challenges its

continued domination. Attempts by the French government and big business to expedite European political and economic integration are thus aimed at involving the French people in a network of independence, halt their advance and bar the road to socialism. The government is determined firmly to entrench itself in the Atlantic bloc and, with the help of its powerful patrons, tie France's destinies to those of imperialism. This integration policy, the characteristic features of which were exposed at our 22nd Party Congress, would place France in a position of feudal dependence on Washington and Bonn. It would worsen the crisis, weaken the country, restrict its sovereignty. This policy is exacting a high price from the people and is menacing their freedom.

French imperialism is impeding and relegating to the background relations with the socialist countries. Its position is tantamount to factual renunciation of the policy of General de Gaulle after 1966, when a new start was made in relations with the Soviet Union. The present government, in contrast, is trying to softpedal political relations with the socialist countries, hold back the process of disarmament and detente and slow down economic and technical co-operation. Insecure relations with the socialist countries is a myopic policy and contradicts France's genuine interests.

French imperialism is seeking to shift all its difficulties on to the young states and bring more pressure to bear on peoples fighting for independence and social progress. Its aim. in short, is to build up a network of reactionary political alliances, from Brazil to Iran, from the Ivory Coast to South Korea, not forgetting, of course, South Africa, Indonesia and Morocco. It has come out against the MPLA in Angola, is supplying nuclear weapons and technology to the South African racialists, demonstrating its hostility to progressive Algeria, building up its military potential in the Mediterranean. It is helping Washington harden the backwardness of the young states in order to enmesh them in insoluble economic and financial difficulties. It regards countries that have broken out of colonialism, for example, in Latin America, as a happy hunting ground for the multinationals. The present French government's aggressive and reactionary policy vis-a-vis countries trying to overcome economic backwardness and strengthen their independence, was trenchantly condemned by the leaders of 86 non-aligned countries at their Colombo Conference in August 1976. Such a policy, which only isolates France and harms its reputation, has nothing in common with the interests of our country and its people.

Still anothing area in which French policy is having a ruinous effect is disarmament and the promotion of peace. And here a disparity between word and deed, so characteristic of the present government, stands out in full clarity. The government has repeatedly and resolutely reaffirmed its intention to use every means at its disposal to reduce world tension and promote detente. Actually, it even declines to participate in international conferences to discuss these problems. More, pleading that this is a "grim" and "dangerous" world ridden with conflicts and disputes, it does not preclude the possibility of using force to settle international disputes. It continues its programme of building up a thermonuclear strike force directed against the socialist countries. It specialises in the sale of weapons to reactionary regimes; though it feigns concern over the proliferation of nuclear weapons, it has not hesitated to take the risk of facilitating such proliferation, for it has agreed to export nuclear technology without any guarantees and its would be used exclusively for peaceful purposes. And so, the French government, which has not acceded to the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty, is assuming a very grave responsibility to mankind.

In sum, French imperialism is obstructing detente, hampering the working out of measures for international disarmament, is opposed to national independence, is narrowing its international co-operation, is imperilling the cause of peace. And with the accentuation of such features of imperialism as oppression, violence and exploitation, there is a growing desire among our people to get rid ot it and achieve socialism by democratic means. The time has come for a new policy of France.

France needs a foreign policy that would uphold its national independence and its

freedom of decision-making, a policy of peace, security and disarmament, international co-operation and friendship among the peoples. The French Communist Party has considered and drawn up the basic directions of such a policy in its documents, Change of Course, and The Democratic Challenge. They were widely discussed and in 1972 became the basis for the Common Government Programme of the Left. They were forcefully reaffirmed at the Party's 22nd Congress in February 1976.

The world balance of forces favours the struggle of the French workers and people for social progress, democracy and socialism, and, at the same time, makes for further positive changes in the balance of forces itself. The basic principles of peaceful coexistence, detente and international co-operation are, at one and the same time, the battlefield of the struggle, its aim and earnest of success. As the demand for democratic change gains in scope and momentum, the masses become increasingly conscious of the international implications of the political struggle waged by the working class and its allies.

The Communists want France to follow an active foreign policy commensurate with the role it could and should play in promoting world peace and co-operation. Its international policy must be carried out in the full view of the people, and framed and implemented in a democratic way. One of the main conditions for this is that France should, under all circumstances, be able to speak with its own voice and make its own decisions. That is what we have in mind when we demand that French policy be decided upon in Paris and not in some other capital. The world does not need a France tagging along in the wake of some other power. It needs a France that is master of its policy and actions, and as such can accomplish very much indeed. This lends special importance to an independent security and co-operation policy, free of supranational strings and foreign interference. For a people like ours national independence is an essential condition of freedom and social progress. And the French learned this from their own experience: at all crucial moments of our history the popular struggle for social progress was closely tied in with the struggle against foreign-supported reactionary gambles. Our nation must be sovereign and independent in managing its affairs.

We are fighting for national independence and can therefore fully appreciate the efforts of other peoples to uphold their sovereignty. Every success they score contributes to the common cause of social emancipation and narrows the action-area of our common enemy, imperialism.

Since French independence is of such great importance for our advance to democracy and socialism, we attach special importance to dismantling military and political blocs. For the fact is that imperialism is not only holding back the detente process, but is using the policy of blocs also to maintain the economic and social status quo and interfere in the affairs of other nations. That fully applies to NATO, which on the pretext of warding off the fictitious "menace from the East" is assuring US imperialism a dominant position and jeopardising French sovereignty on issues that directly affect its future. That is why the Communists have exposed and combated France's return to NATO.

The French Communist Party agreed for the Common Government Programme not to insist on France's withdrawal from NATO. The Party attaches much importance to the fact that, on its initiative, all the Left forces have reaffirmed their resolve to make the country independent of all military blocs. We do not advocate withdrawing from one bloc to join another. What we do advocate is the simultaneous dissolution of NATO and the Warsaw Treaty Organisation, an end to the very existence of military-political blocs. Pending that and the creation of a collective security system, we shall favour observation of existing allied commitments, but in conditions of independence. Thus, for instance, NATO must not go beyond the obligation of mutual assistance in the event of an external threat or pressure. As for the plans to set up a united Western Europe, our main consideration is that France should retain freedom of action. Accordingly, the French Communists are against attempts to set up a European military-political bloc or a regional unit of the Atlantic system under the signboard of a "European political union".

This should not be taken to mean that France should stay in its own shell, in some kind of national autarchy. What we need is a new policy attuned to the requirements of national independence and international co-operation. It would not lead to isolation, nor make France more vulnerable. On the contrary, it would assure genuine security under all circumstances. For French security requires, above all, an active role in promoting detente and initiatives in establishing a collective security system, which would guarantee the security of France and of all other European countries in conditions of independence and equality. In this context, the ten principles governing relations between the 35 states represented at the Helsinki Conference in August 1975 are an important step forward. Fulfilment of all the provisions of the Helsinki Final Act would carry us a long way towards a stable and durable European collective security system and would expand co-operation between its countries.

Complete, universal and controlled disarmament is now the prime objective in assuring the security of France and world peace. And here the popular struggle acquires exceptional importance. The French Communist Party believes that to promote disarmament France should lose no time in actively participating in the Geneva and Vienna negotiations, accede to the relevant international agreements, notably the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty, and, without waiting for an overall nuclear weapons ban, undertake never to be the first to use nuclear weapons. France must cease the sale of weapons to fascist and racialist countries and also to aggressor countries.

France's security rests also on its policy of national defence which should have only one single aim, namely, defence of our national territory against any possible aggressor. Such a policy must preclude obligations likely to endanger French sovereignty in military matters. Our defence policy should not be built around priority for nuclear weapons. Our military establishment should take the form of a modern democratic army organised on the basis of national service.

And so, a policy of national independence, peace and security, but at the same time a policy of broad international co-operation, for independence and co-operation go hand in hand. The task is to assure France's security and independence and elevate to a higher level its international contacts in all fields, political, economic, scientific and cultural. Developing co-operation with all states without discrimination or restrictions, on the basis of equality, non-interference, respect of sovereignty and mutual advantage—such is the dictate of the times.

The future democratic France will extend and enrich its relations of co-operation and strengthen its friendly ties with all countries. Co-operation will rest on an initiative policy designed to uphold the independence of the peoples and promote peace and friendship. It is only in this way that France can contribute to the adjustment of aggravated conflicts, particularly in the Middle East, through liberation of the Arab territories occupied in 1967, recognition of the national right of the Palestinian people and the right to existence of all the states of the region. France must share in the UN sanctions against the racialist states of Southern Africa, cease all military co-operation with them. It must recognise the Democratic People's Republic of Korea.

Our people have demonstrated their active solidarity with all nations striving for freedom, with the victims of fascism, foreign intervention, colonialism and neocolonialism, with the peoples of Europe, Africa, Asia and Latin America. We have displayed our solidarity with the peoples of French overseas departments and territories still under the iron heel of French colonialism, with their struggle for genuine democratic freedoms and for the right freely to shape their destinies.

France should devote special attention to assuring genuine security in the Mediterranean. It should play an active part in the UN and various international organisations dedicated to world peace. It should contribute to the establishment of a new international economic order, and more just political and economic relations between states, irrespective of their level of development.

Co-operation with all countries must be free of discrimination, should strive to break

the stranglehold of the big industrial and banking monopolies on the newly independent states, and promote closer relations with the socialist countries. It should also develop relations with various European and non-European capitalist countries, in particular with such big industrial powers as the United States and Japan. This is possible only on the basis of mutual advantage and respect for the sovereignty of all, as Georges Marchais emphasised during his visit to Japan.

Co-operation with the EEC countries will continue, but with the aim of reorganising the EEC along democratic lines, in the interests of the working people, and to free it of all monopoly control. In this sense, there can be no real freedom where there is supranational control. For the freedom of each people to decide its future, promulgate its own laws, fashion its social and political structure, is an essential element of democracy. That is why we are categorically opposed to renunciation of national interests, particularly the transfer of certain functions of national parliaments to the European Assembly and expansion of its prerogatives under cover of general elections.

Throughout capitalist Europe, in the specific conditions of each country and people, the workers encounter one and the same class enemy. Our struggle helps to weaken his forces and helps our advance. Today and in the future, that struggle can rely, at one and the same time, on working class and popular actions in neighbouring countries. In this sense, the Brussels conference of Communist and Workers' parties of capitalist Europe was a very important landmark; it facilitated joint action of the vanguard parties of the working class and the people in this part of the continent.

Our struggle for a policy worthy of France, a policy of independence, peace and co-operation, accords with the interests of the French people. It accords also with the traditions of freedom, social emancipation and internationalism that have always been a part of the working-class and democratic movements. Our struggle helps unite all the oppressed sections of the nation into a union of the people of France against monopoly rule. And though directed against imperialism, our struggle is a component part of the people's desire for peace, sovereignty, security and social progress.

A Journey into Inflation

Topical Notes

AFTER a fairly long stay in Prague I made a return journey home to Northern Ireland where I spent two months, and I would like to share some of my impressions with readers of this journal.

Belfast, the capital of Northern Ireland, is the centre of the turbulent political life of the entire province, an arena of police violence and unending clashes between armed extremists from among the Protestant majority and Catholic minority. I have already had occasion—and probably will still have—to write about this aspect of Northern Ireland's life in this journal. But Belfast is also a big industrial city with a population of 400,000. Its inhabitants suffer severely not only from extremist outrages, but also from the consequences of the capitalist crisis, economic dislocation, mounting unemployment and runaway inflation. When I began to stock up my home larder and to pay for services, etc., I realised just how much the cost of living had gone up in the short time (less than a year) I had been away and how deeply inflation had become part of our "way of life".

The flight from Prague to Belfast, taking only a little more than three hours, turned out to be a journey to the reign of inflation, as it were. It seemed like a fairy tale in reverse.

In the short space of time I had been away from home the cost of ten Belfast Citybus tokens had increased from 50p to 90p; the journey from the Belfast Airport into the city centre from 50p to 70p; and a three-day rail ticket to Dublin had been inflated to £6.65—for a week or more to £10 return fare! The quarterly charges for Belfast city gas

had gone up considerably and, even if one did not use one cubic metre in the quarter, one was required to pay a charge of £3. My neighbours warned me not to use any electricity, if I could help it, and especially not to use the electric water heater. There was much talk of rent increases. I was able to avoid these because of the rent rebate system for publicly-owned housing and the fact that I am a pensioner. (There is also a rates rebate system which I have been able to take advantage of—but one does not know, with the cuts in public expenditure, how long these will last).

When I came to the business of buying food I was really taken aback. The price of a pound of butter before I left in November 1975, was about 25 to 27p—depending on where one shopped. Whilst I was at home—from August to October—the price was 38p and went up each week by 2p until it scaled 50p per pound. Staple foods such as porridge oats, potatoes, bread, etc., are reaching the "luxury class". One paid 55p to 59p for seven pounds of potatoes—more than twice as much as the previous year. A 3-pound bag of porridge oats had been increased from 35p to 53p. Bread, a 28-ounce loaf, had gone up from 17p to 20p and, in the two months I was at home, went up three times in price to 23½p.

The prices for meat and fish had gone up beyond all knowing. The most popular and cheaper kinds of fish ranged in price from, per pound, 60p, 70p and over 80p. Frying steak, which had cost about 75p to 80p per pound, was now up to £1.50. Even the humble sausage and sausage meats had been increased from 44p to 60p per pound. The price of pork meat, depending on how one bought it, could cost up to £2 per pound. (It was thought, when meat prices began to rise before entry into the EEC, that chickens would be a family "standby"—but that hope soon evaporated.)

Fruit and vegetables are now sold by weight, and one can pay as much as 12p for a small turnip, carrots nearly 16p each and onions, which had averaged about 6p per pound, are now in the region of 14p per pound. Apples, oranges, etc., one needed them very much before deciding to purchase. Tomatoes, in one week, increased in price from 12-15p per pound to 40p, and this at the height of the tomato season! (One finds that at weekends when the main shopping is done for the family, prices can increase considerably and I therefore learned to shop during other weekdays).

The cost of tea—44p per pound before I left Belfast—had gone up to 60p per pound. The price of ground coffee, which had been around £1 per pound, is expected to go up to £2 per pound before the year is out. The cost of "instant" coffee, in ounces, beggars description. Eggs, which formerly sold at 26p to 30p per dozen, had reached 54p by October last.

Whilst I was at home, the Dublin government, at the EEC talks on meat and bacon prices, were able to obtain a devaluation of the so-called Green Pound. This meant for farmers in the Irish Republic an increase of 5p per pound for pork or beef, or £10 extra for pigs and up to £25 for a cow. The British government did not want such devaluation as it would have added to the price of food. For farmers in Northern Ireland this was not satisfactory and pigs and cows began to be "smuggled" over the border to get the higher prices. The six Northern Ireland bacon and meat processing factories (employing directly 2,500 workers and, indirectly, many more thousands) were left without one pig or cow to process in a whole week. The factory owners stated that all workers would be laid off. The London government was forced to step in and make good the price difference. Needless to say, during that week, prices for meat and bacon escalated still further in the retail shops. Cattle were being rushed to Britain and elsewhere.

The drought during the year also brought its problems in the potato market. Farmers in Northern Ireland and the Irish Republic began to "smuggle" potatoes out of Ireland into the British market—to get the "price".

The price of milk had gone up from 5p per pint to 10½p—and is expected, after EEC decisions, to go up another 2p per pint, before the winter is over.

The prices of manufactured goods had also risen. One needed batteries for one's radio. In November 1975, the cost of a PP7 battery was 35p. The cost in August was 58p and was

increased to 61p a week later. For a small Bush radio, which requires two batteries, the cost had been 54p for two—in August 1976 it was inflated to 51p for one battery!

(I was fortunate in that, before I left Belfast in November 1975. I had bought in soap, soap powders, etc. Otherwise my saga of price increases might have been much longer and more woeful).

One of the most disturbing things that one found when at home was the feeling of the people that there was little or nothing they could do about the high prices for goods and services. The propaganda of the British government, as is the case of all governments in the capitalist world, creates the illusion that all our troubles stem from "international conditions" over which the government can exercise no control. The government, backed by the mass media and the economic "experts", is therefore absolved from all blame or responsibility for the unprecedented inflation. Yet the official retail price index for October (Britain and Northern Ireland) had increased by 1.8 per cent from the previous month. If this rate is maintained—and one sees no indication that it will do otherwise—the annual rate of inflation will go up to 22 per cent.

In capitalist society there are those, even in the ranks of the working class, who are receiving high wages and can afford to pay the prices asked for. How long this will last one would not attempt to hazard a guess. Needless to say, those on fixed incomes, pensioners, the sick and unemployed and in the low wage and salary brackets, find it impossible to purchase the goods and services they require.

I returned to Prague to find all was as I had left it—with the great exception that prices for many fruits and vegetables had gone down! The shops were crowded with people already buying gifts for Christmas. And I remembered an article in our journal by a Czechoslovak Minister which cited striking figures showing that the retail prices of staple foods had not changed in the country for a whole decade.[1]

I have made two "return journeys" in a short space of time. One home to Belfast and one back to Prague and they have taught me much. And I thought: what would those people in Northern Ireland, who looked askance at what I told them about the stability of prices in the socialist world, have said had they seen the life of socialist Czechoslovakia with their own eyes? And another thought occurred to me: how important it is for us Communists to be able to persuade the common people in capitalist countries to listen to the truth that socialism with its planned economy makes people confident of the morrow, eliminates their fear of the future and protects their everyday life.

Betty Sinclair
Representative of the Communist
Party of Ireland on the journal

[1] To those who may take an interest in this question I would recommend a very interesting article by Michal Sabolcik "Price Policy under Socialism", *WMR*, March 1975.

The Social Purpose of Artistic Creation

RASUL GAMZATOV
Soviet writer

NOWADAYS when bourgeois authors write (and at great length) about the freedom of artistic creation, one is struck by their abstract and scholastic approach. The personality of the artist is regarded out of context of time and place. Indeed, one is often led to think of him as a robot, with only the cold surface of his metal shell keeping him "in touch" with the world.

But, then, what talk can there be of freedom? For the free flight of creative fantasy is

inconceivable without close involvement with the world around us, its affairs and concerns. Consequently, the problem of creative freedom cannot be solved in isolation from another problem, the social purpose of art.

It is on this point, I think, that bourgeois authors and we, Soviet writers, artists and musicians, differ in the approach to creative freedom. And this has to be taken into account if one really wants to work for freedom of artistic creation and for the free exchange of cultural values created under different social systems.

In a socialist society, the artist's social involvement is an inalienable element of his creative freedom. That is the subject I propose to discuss in these notes without, however, laying claim to complete coverage, for I am a writer and not a specialist in aesthetics. And I shall concentrate on poetry, a sphere of creativity most near to me.

For the Soviet poet there is no barrier between creative freedom and the social purpose of his work, which he regards as a civic duty. The fusion of the two is so organic and natural, that in his work the poet is not inclined to reflect on whether or not he is free, on whether his work is hamstrung by the "social contract" he assumes voluntarily as part of his feelings and conscience. Of course, there are poets who compose mediocre verse "to order" with scant regard to their artistic value. But I am not discussing that type of poet, but rather poets with a high sense of civic duty that determines their understanding of their creative work, and their place in society, which for them is synonymous with freedom.

The calling of the poet resides above all in his sincere, deep-felt need to serve the people. And he is so conscious of his duty to the people that such lines as these of Mayakovsky, "My verse is born of kinship with the fighters and the country; it is born in my heart," come just as naturally as breathing.

The artist trained in the traditions of bourgeois culture questions the social purpose of art: every calling implies a duty, an obligation, dedication, and can a poet create freely and unhampered if he is weighed down by a duty?

The question is as old as poetry itself and, it would seem, has long been resolved by the experience of Soviet literature and of the great writers of the past. Nevertheless, it is still being hotly discussed by the exponents of "absolute freedom" of creativity, by those who subscribe to the elitist interpretation of art. The ideal of the socially-committed poet is less than popular with them. On occasion they are prepared to concede that in the past that ideal did command attraction. In the past, but not today. Because, they argue, ours is a different age: there is more unfreedom of the personality, in particular of the creative personality. In this age, we are told, man is doomed to self-isolation, to all his creative and spiritual potentialities finding expression in the personal sphere, or to use the elegant euphemism, in "pianissimo". One can understand the sources of this hopeless philosophy in a bourgeois society. It stems from the decadent degrading sentiments cultivated by bourgeois art. But its exponents are seeking to convert poets of the socialist world to their creed.

In my travels in the capitalist world I found that such views were held even by some serious artists, poets and musicians. And I could not get away from the feeling that someone was deliberately out to cage the free muse of poesy. It was strange, for instance, to hear people saying that the poet's main interest should be confined to the area of intimate feelings. Yes, love lyrics have always had a deep humanistic message, without which there can be no real poetry. But there always have been (and always will be) poets with a much wider gamut: some apply their craftsmanship to recording a momentary impression, others delicately and sensitively express the more intimate in man's life, still others devote their poetry to noble social aims. I often venture to compare literature with the *pandur*, and writers with the strings of folk instruments, for each string has its own sound and together they produce a chord.

No normal society can dispense with such an instrument. It would be hard indeed to imagine a more tedious and boring collection of muses on the Parnassus of our time if the supporters of "pianissimo" were able to win over all the poets of the world, and if the poet's creativity, individual in its very essence, were compressed into the deeply individualistic

philosophy of despair.

However, that philosophy cannot stand up to the real riches and artistic diversity of today's world poetry. The dynamic development of progressive world culture, passionately committed to the ideals of peace, social progress and humanity, is oriented on the great achievements of the classics. It has never been, and never will be, captive to the individualistic vision of the world. That is so because the reader of today, the people, mankind, have a much weightier say in determining the ideal of the poet and of poetry. The experts, on the other hand, have an increasingly lesser say, Genuine poetry is accessible to the mass reader, and he is the final judge.

The reader has his own classification of poets.

Some interest him but leave him indifferent.

Others interest him, too, and he is prepared to discuss their work, but it does not evoke an answering chord.

Still others are poets for whom the reader is prepared to fight, and who themselves are fighters. They are seldom discussed, but highly appreciated by the reader; their verses are listened to with rapt attention, their books enjoy a wide readership. Such poets were Pablo Neruda and, in our Soviet literature, Alexander Tvardovsky. They commanded attention and respect, the respect, say, a patient has for a surgeon: what will his scalpel bring, salvation or death?

There are poets of consummate craftsmanship. And here I would mention Boris Pasternak, Anna Akhmatova, Marina Tsvetayeva. They are highly praised by professional critics. And rightly so. But the critics at times tend to contrast them to poets of no lesser talent, but dedicated to the struggle for the triumph of the noble social ideals. I am convinced that all poets are remarkable if they are sincere and courageous in their devotion to the destinies of their people, of man and mankind. The concept genuine poet is inseparable from the concept people's poet.

Neruda and Tvardovsky were people's poets in the true sense of the word. Poetry was their life's vocation, the dictate of the heart, utter devotion to their civic duty.

I recall being in hospital with Tvardovsky. He was no longer bedridden, and one evening we walked to a remote lawn of the hospital park and Tvardovsky lit a bonfire. We were joined by other patients, convalescents and those who would never regain their health. We smoked, talked about things personal and public. Tvardovsky listened, now and again joining in the conversation to agree or argue. All the sorrows and joys of the world were in his heart, and in his poetry.

That, I feel, is the ideal of the contemporary poet. At any rate, I have always striven for that ideal. And even now I live and work with the feeling that I am still sitting beside Tvardovsky at that bonfire. I am always astonished when I hear people say that that type of poet is rather like the extinct mammoth, or that he belongs to the 19th century.

Tvardovsky was a man of remarkable integrity, and this he carried into his poetry, which was a fusion of sincerity, deep intimacy and fidelity to his social ideals. Hence, the rare combination in his work of different genres, from penetratingly precise lyrical miniatures to poems of truly epic magnitude.

Paradoxically, some try to instil in the Soviet writer the idea that fidelity to one's social duty can only hamper creativity and turn the artist into a dual personality by injecting something entirely alien to the purity of his poetic world. This is but a rehash of a book published in Russia before the October Revolution by the so-called *Vekhovtsi*, who sought to vilify all that was progressive and democratic in the Russian culture associated with the revolutionary liberation movement.

The Soviet poet's appreciation of the social purpose of literature is not something indoctrinated. It stems from life itself, from the poet's experience, from his inner convictions. I know of poets who early in their careers decided to seal themselves off from the storms and complexities of their time and devote their talents to the eternal themes of love, nature, reflection. Some of them even decided to retreat into a pastoral life and compose paeans to nature. For some this bucolic dream came true, and they produced a

goodly number of books. But they did not become real poets. On the other hand, those who—whether by choice or by circumstances—took another road and shared with the people their historical destiny, became poets of stature and led a meaningful life, without which there can be no great poet.

Only by merging one's own destiny with that of the people does the artist acquire his identity and genuine creative freedom. This simple truth is not understood—in some cases wilfully—by those who would inculcate in the poet an elitist conception of his place in society. By giving his all to the people, they aver, the poet is submerged in the people, loses his individuality and the possibility fully to express his own "I". But has there been a single case in the history of poetry of a poet creating a meaningful work by holding aloof from the people, or looking down on them from the heights of his poetic Olympus?

There have been no such cases. All the more surprising, therefore, are the assiduous attempts to place the poet in an ivory tower, of a more modern model, needless to say. The retreat into "pianissimo", mentioned above, is one such model. There are many others.

I have had occasion to comment on a speech made at an international gathering of poets not so very long ago. This is what the speaker said:

"Ladies and gentlemen, we are gathered here from different countries. You represent different nations. Only I do not represent any nation or any country; I represent all nations, all countries, for I represent poetry. Yes, I am poetry. I am the sun that illumines the planet, the rain that freshens the earth, the tree that flowers in every clime."

This poet raised his modernised ivory tower to cosmic heights. Many applauded him, but in the way they would applaud an accomplished circus performer. I, too, believe that we poets are really responsible for the whole world, but he who is not tied to his native land, his people, cannot represent the world. Like every other person, the poet must from early youth realise that he will become a representative of his people and must prepare himself to act as such. Otherwise he will fall prey to indifference, that fatal malady of poetry.

For the Soviet poet, social purpose implies devotion to the ideals of the Great October Socialist Revolution, in which he sees the radiant future of his people. And when some try to persuade us to abandon that devotion, I hear the voice of those who would stifle poetry by indifference, deprive the poet of any share in the people's life, turn him into a mere onlooker. Can a man who stands apart from the destiny of the people represent them?

Alexander Blok urged the intelligentsia to "hearken the music of the future, the music of revolution", Our finest poets had an ardent filial feeling for the Revolution. I know that from my father, the renowned Avar poet Gamzat Tsadase. And I recall Tvardovsky's attitude, too. He could not tolerate highfalutin words, but it was with deep internal conviction that he spoke of the Revolution as his mother, adding: some, standing aside, will probably see her shortcomings, but for me she is my mother. His was not a blind love, and he declared it not as a young man, but at a stage in life when he had already travelled a long and difficult road. In our mountain country there is the saying that at this stage people acquire a mature understanding of what life is all about.

I will not be divulging any secret if I say that among our intellectuals there are those (not many, actually a few individuals) who do not share entirely or certain aspects of this attitude to the Revolution, which is the very core of the Soviet writer's world outlook. The bourgeois press calls them dissidents and is at pains to make out that in our society dissidence is a punishable crime. It is moved to ecstasy when one or another dissident is tried for an obviously criminal act. The bourgeois press can be relied upon to raise a hue and cry about him being tried for his politics. As a member of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet I have had occasion to examine appeals against court sentences in cases of this kind. And these bourgeois press comments surprise me, for when an appeal is examined, it is not the thoughts of the accused, but his concrete actions, for which he was tried in court in full conformity with the laws of our socialist state, that are taken into consideration. Thus, "persecution of dissident thoughts" has nothing to do with it. It is purely a matter of observing revolutionary law and of the need to defend the gains of our

Revolution.

The fate of my own Daghestan and my career in literature are likewise insolubly tied with the Revolution. Soviet power opened wide vistas to my people, who up to then lived a secluded life in the narrow mountain valleys of the Caucasus. At the time of the Revolution, Daghestan literature did not go beyond folklore, with its traditional genres and expression media. The Revolution brought my people into the wide world of culture, while retaining and giving more vivid expression to our national traditions. And what can be more necessary for giving full and free scope to the abilities and talents of the poet than a wider vision, enabling him to judge and depict life without bias, while maintaining the artistic identity of his people!

Adherence to the ideals of Lenin's Party is still another cardinal feature of the Soviet poet's social mission. But Communist partisanship implies more than simply choosing a definite political doctrine. If that were so, there would be some justification for the charge that Soviet writers take their instructions from the Communist Party. The fact, however, is that every writer, if he is honest and sincere, accepts and upholds the Party's ideas at the dictate of his conscience. For him partisanship means loyalty to the cause of Lenin, whom Einstein described as one of the custodians and renewers of the conscience of mankind.

It is his conscience that prompts the Soviet poet to express and uphold the ideas of the Party. Those who denounce that as loss of creative freedom, as writing "under Party dictation", fail to understand that without conscience, in its Leninist understanding, there is no Soviet poet, and no free flight of his creative fantasy, and no social responsibility for his work.

In our age every big poet quickly wins world renown. His verse is part of the battle of ideas in his own country and the world. This immensely increases his responsibility not only for every word that comes from his pen, but for his every action as a member of society. We should learn this feeling of responsibility from such of our predecessors as Julius Fucik, who had a boundless love of people and, in his last words from the gallows, urged them to be vigilant. More and more the world is coming to realise that life on the brink of war lays a heavy material and spiritual burden on the peoples. And it is our bounden duty as poets to defend the frontiers of good will, love and compassion against the forces of evil, hatred and callousness.

That is why the people everywhere are now so exacting in relation to their poets. They do not forgive them a single false word. Now as never before, the poet cannot afford to be a shadow of his time; he must be a flame, a source of light.

Light should not be equated with seeing things through rosy spectacles. The poet cannot see the world as, say, a young man sees his future bride, blind to all her minor faults. Nor must he contemptuously see the world through dark spectacles: both produce a false picture the reader will not accept.

The social mission of the poet implies conscious service to the ideals of goodness and justice. Today the interconnection between the national and international in the poet's creation is especially acutely felt. For the progressive maturing of national literatures brings them into the realm of world culture. And here there are confrontations between historically-formed artistic traditions and mutually-opposed ideological and artistic principles.

In his own native literature, too, the poet has to choose a correct orientation if he wants to enjoy genuine creative freedom and not be entrapped by anarchistic concepts of freedom which, for all their exterior brilliance, usually lead to feeble epigonic imitations. The experience of history and of the great Russian and Soviet literature shows that the highroad of mankind's artistic progress lies in a literature which, in one or another way, is associated with progressive and revolutionary movements, a literature, consequently, that is deeply internationalist in its ideological and artistic content.

The foes of progressive culture are doing everything to discredit the spirit of internationalism, an intrinsic feature of the great poets of our time. They are at pains to prove that internationalism imperils national identity and, consequently, freedom of

class-irrelevant interpretations of the problems of democracy, multi-party structures, political opposition and human rights. In fact, its concepts have now been brought to the forefront of the ideological struggle. Marxist literature, albeit belatedly, has criticised these pluralistic concepts in all their aspects, philosophical, political and ideological.[3]

Bourgeois Theory and Methodology

Pluralism has for many bourgeois ideologists and reformists become practically synonymous with the Western way of life. Originally, however, it was employed to describe quite other phenomena. It was first used in the second half of the 18th century by the German philosopher Christian Wolf, who described as pluralistic philosophical systems which, as distinct from the consistently materialist and idealist schools, maintained that explanation of the universe rested not on one, but on several independent principles. Philosophical pluralism, and particularly eclecticism, were trenchantly criticised by Marx, Engels and Lenin. In this century philosophical pluralism finds its main expression in pragmatism.[4] Pluralism has exerted a marked influence on representatives of other schools of modern bougeois philosophy, i.e., neopositivism (Bertrand Russell, Ludwig Wittgenstein, Karl Popper), critical realism (Santayana, Sellars), existentialism (Jean-Paul Satre).

The first attempts to apply the philosophy of pluralism to analysis of social phenomena date back to the turn of the century. The outstanding example was the so-called "multi-factor theory", which in our day has been adopted, with certain modifications, by many bourgeois ideologists. It seeks to explain the development of society as the result of the operation of many independent factors, such as environment, heredity, economics, science, ideology, politics, etc. It arose as an alternative to Marxism which the pluralists denounce as a "unifactor" concept since, they argue, it negates all other motive forces and impulses of social progress, save economic ones. Having produced this caricature of Marxism, the pluralists (Popper, for instance) maintained that the economic factor must never be overestimated, for otherwise we would be "belittling" the importance of ideas and decisions.[5]

However, pluralism has itself undergone substantial change. Philosophical pluralism is being complemented by political, ideological pluralism, each of which purports to explain the essence and development laws of a definite area of social life. Thus, from an abstract philosophical idea about the structure of being, pluralism has developed into one of the main schools of bourgeois sociology and politology opposed to Marxism-Leninism. More, its anti-Marxist and anti-socialist orientation is becoming progressively more pronounced.

Its bourgeois class nature is especially apparent in political pluralism (also known as "pluralistic democracy").[6] Its exponents hold up their false picture of the social structure and political system of modern capitalism as a model for all time. They reject the Marxist-Leninist doctrine of classes and the class struggle. Instead, they have put forth the wholly unscientific theory of "social stratification" and "group structures". The object is to depict government by big capital as collective government by various "pressure groups" or "interest groups" and their organisations. The latter include employers' federations, political parties, the trade unions, farmer organisations, all manner of religious, cultural associations, etc. These "interest groups", the argument goes, share in social control and administration through their respective organisations. In other words, the pluralists want to convince the working class that it, too, has a share in managing the affairs of society, and all that is now needed is to arrange for the co-operation of all these public bodies, so that there could be no question of the workers fighting the capitalists and their state.

The pluralists like to pose as the heirs to the philosophical and legal democratic traditions associated with the ideologists of the Enlightenment and 19th century liberalism—Montesquieu, Locke, Mill and Tocqueville. Actually, however, they differ from them on a crucial point, for they negate the idea of social progress. The rivalry, deals and compromises between the numerous "interest groups", the pluralists say, is the

mainspring of the economic and political life of society. This, of course, ignores the struggle to transform capitalist socio-economic and political structures. In particular, political opposition is allowed only to the extent that it does not encroach on the foundations of capitalist society. The very idea of eliminating bourgeois society and its revolutionary replacement by a new society is dismissed as "extremism" that runs counter to pluralism.

And so, pluralism is a bourgeois theory and methodology incompatible with Marxism-Leninism. Nor is it a question of whether or not we should use the word "pluralism". For it is not words that matter, though terminological accuracy can sometimes prove very important inasmuch as many terms have their origins in historical traditions and represent a system of interpreting and analysing reality. But the word "pluralism" stands for bourgeois traditions and for a bourgeois system of analysis based on the group rather than the class structure of society, and disregards the class antagonism between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie, and the fundamental differences between capitalist and socialist societies.

The theory of political pluralism has held practically undivided sway in bourgeois politology since the war. In recent years, however, notably with the deepening of the political crisis of capitalism and of bourgeois democracy, there have been definite changes. They show that pluralism is losing ground for it has proved manifestly inadequate to explain capitalist reality and is now giving way to elitist concepts.[7]

Paradoxical though it may seem, precisely at a time when political pluralism, that idealised model of bourgeois democracy, has so glaringly proved at odds with capitalist reality, it is being recommended as a means of "improving" the political system of socialism, by fitting it into models copied from capitalism.

Weapon Against Popular Rule

One can single out two distinct methods employed by bourgeois ideologists and reformists to "improve" socialist society by injecting pluralism.

The first is associated with the concept of a multiplicity of "models of Marxism and socialism". Of course, there is nothing wrong in the idea of a variety of concrete forms of socialism or the search for different roads to socialism. But the pluralists want a variety not of forms, but of substance. In their understanding, a multiplicity of models means that socialist society in different countries will not subscribe to socialism's fundamental economic, political and cultural ideas. This is not substantiated by experience, which shows that, *for all the different roads to socialism, and all the different forms of the new society*, the essence of socialism remains the same.

Such bourgeois and reformist pluralist "models" as "market socialism", "democratic socialism", "humane socialism", "national socialism", etc., are expressly directed against Marxism-Leninism and existing socialism. All these models are devised either by adding various non-socialist elements to the tested experience of building the new society, or, conversely, by subtracting from scientific socialism some of its fundamental principles. As for the different "variants" of Marxism-Leninism, they are no more and no less than right or "left" deviations or bourgeois ideological trends that exploit the authority of the ideas of Marx and Lenin. Obviously, this propaganda of a "pluralistic panorama" of Marxism and socialism is meant to erode the unity of the philosophical and theoretical basis of the Communist movement.

The other method is to impose on socialist society the "pluralistic structure" of bourgeois society, with all its characteristic attributes, including incessant rivalry between the various parties, among them parties opposed to the socialist system and popular rule. Let us take a closer look at this method.

The multiplicity of political organisations and trends, their "equality" in social life, periodical change of ruling parties and groups, are supposed to reflect the multistratic and differentiated character of the social structure of society, with a large number of groups, whose private interests are upheld by specific organisations, primarily the political

parties.[8] *And from this the conclusion is drawn that the constant struggle for power, which stems from the rivalry of the various interests; their "reconciliation", the search for partial agreements, etc., is the most rational way of assuring the "self-regulation" of society.* And "self-regulation", they argue, is assured by "pluralistic democracy" which is held up as the "supreme type of democracy". The democracy of the socialist countries is judged by the degree to which they adhere to this pluralistic model.

The fallacy of all these theories, I think, rests, above all, in their disregard of the fundamental differences between class relations under capitalism and socialism. The class structure of capitalist society, the irreconcilable interests of exploiters and exploited, the heterogeneity of the bourgeoisie as a class—all this logically leads to a multiplicity of political parties and their struggle for power.

That, of course, does not apply to socialism. Abolition of private ownership of the means of production and the strengthening of socialist production relations steadily enhance the social and political unity of the new society. The process of overcoming class distinctions is consummated with the building of communism. But even at the present stage, the socialist countries have removed the chief source of class and national conflicts and clashes. For society is no longer divided into exploiters and exploited, oppressors and oppressed. And it is on this basis that socialism builds its effective mechanism of popular rule. Irrespective of how the political system of one or another socialist country has formed historically, whether it has many parties or only one, solution of all the multiform and complex problems is achieved through co-operation of friendly labouring classes and social groups, with the leading role of the working class, headed by its Marxist-Leninist party.

Experience shows that the socialist political system does not rule out the existence of several parties.

Parties and alignments that join in the people's common struggle for democracy and social progress can also go on operating at the stage of developed socialism. The Bulgarian Agricultural People's Union, which took an active part in alliance with the BCP in the fight against fascism, gradually adopted scientific socialism as the only scientific ideology also leading to the emancipation of the working peasantry from exploitation and oppression. Today it is building socialism together with the BCP. The Bulgarian Social Democratic Party merged with the BCP, and as for the Radicals and the Zveno party, they joined the Patriotic Front. Pluralists do not advocate just any multiparty system but one guaranteeing "equal opportunities" in socialist society for political opposition to people's rule.

In political reality, the thesis of "equal opportunities", alleged to be provided by bourgeois democracy for all political alignments, is applied mostly to parties competing for state power according to the rules of the capitalist system but not assailing its foundations.[9] Bourgeois pluralists would like the working-class party to exist as a mere "opposition" integrated into the capitalist political structure like any bourgeois party and subordinating the workers to the capitalist system. They do all they can to bar revolutionary parties of the working class from government. These parties are a special type of opposition inasmuch as they fight for the revolutionary transformation of capitalist society. Besides, the existence and activity of Communist parties under bourgeois democracy are admittedly not a gift to the people from the liberals but a result of revolutionary struggle by the working class. The imperialists stop at nothing when their economic and political domination is threatened.

As we see it, the destiny of political opposition under socialism and the concrete historical framework of its existence in countries taking the socialist road depend on the state attained by socialism in the country concerned, on the degree of its maturity, and the actual trend of the class struggle. In the period of transition, a period characterised by a multistructure economy, which means that social antagonisms persist, there is a definite social basis for the existence of parties opposed to socialism. In Bulgaria, for instance, the regime of the BCP-led Patriotic Front, established in 1944 through an armed rising,

authorised the existence of opposition parties. These parties took part in the first free elections and won about 30 per cent of the seats in the People's Assembly. However, they went beyond political activity within legal bounds by engaging in subversion and in preparations for armed struggle against people's rule, with the result that they were dissolved in 1946.

The question arises: Given a different set of circumstances, could anti-socialist and anti-popular forces exist forever in a society that had taken a socialist path? In answering this, it should be borne in mind that when socialism has been built the objective basis for their activity disappears. As for the fate of opposition parties and alignments, it depends on whether they reorganise according to the new social and political reality and the demands of the masses.

Thus the mechanism of "political pluralism" typical of bourgeois society and needed as a means of disguising the domination of society by a handful of monopolies, loses every objective basis under an entirely different social system guaranteeing genuine people's rule. We are convinced that the criterion of democracy under socialism is not the number of political parties, nor the "right" of an "opposition" hostile to people's rule to operate, but the extent to which the working class and other working people participate in government. Experience shows that the establishment of socialist rule does not stop the development of democracy, which, however, takes a new direction and assumes a class character, being exercised in the working people's interests, with the entire population participating ever more effectively.

Bourgeois pluralists would have the working people of socialist countries believe that only a multiparty system of the capitalist type, with an inevitable rotation of parties in the government, is a "guarantee" of democracy and freedom and can impart proper dynamism to the development of society irrespective of whether it is a socialist or a bourgeois society. Let us note at this point that in Bulgaria, for instance, a parliamentary system went on functioning for more than ten years after the establishment of a fascist regime (1923) and so did opposition parties. And we know from history that there have been many other cases of reactionary dictatorial regimes in the capitalist world taking the form of multiparty systems.

However, bourgeois democracy does not necessarily imply, either in theory or in practice, the existence of several parties and an opposition. At the dawn of bourgeois democracy, Rousseau and certain other ideologists of a rising bourgeoisie tried to prove theoretically the necessity for a bourgeois democratic system with a unitary, or monistic, social structure ruling out all opposition, while the Jacobin dictatorship strove to set it up. Under capitalism, attempts of this kind were bound to prove Utopian since its political system can neither express nor execute the will and interests of the people. It does not follow, however, that under no other social system can there be democracy without a political opposition.

In criticising the political system of developed socialism, pluralists accuse it of lacking a mechanism for the early detection and removal of shortcomings that arise in the course of social development, and of inability to meet the manifold interests of diverse social groups. These interests do exist but socialist democracy, far from ignoring them, evolves and continuously perfects a system of agencies whose functions include fulfilment of this particular task. This system comprises the trade unions, which unite almost all wage and salary earners, the co-operatives, which in most socialist countries encompass the majority of peasants, youth organisations, scientific and cultural societies, unions of creative workers, and so on. The political system of mature socialism sees to it that the interests of diverse social groups and collectives are linked with the interests of society as a whole and gives them a common trend.

As regards shortcomings and problems that arise as socialist society develops, the latter creates special mechanisms of its own to detect and remove them. These mechanisms include, first and foremost, criticism and self-criticism and the activity of government and voluntary control bodies.

The effectiveness of socialist democracy and its superiority over bourgeois democracy have been demonstrated by the history of the new society. The immense achievements of world socialism in every public sphere would have been unthinkable without the system of genuine people's rule that socialism has established and is steadily perfecting.

Subversion Under the Guise of "Ideological Equality"

Present-day pluralism lays claim to the status of a universal doctrine covering all public life, including its spiritual aspect. Its fundamental thesis is that there have always existed *numerous* ideologies and ideological trends operating simultaneously and that they will *always exist, disputing one another.* As in the case of political alignments, it contends that there must be "equal opportunities" for different ideologies.

To understand the true meaning of this claim, one must take account of the fact that the world-wide struggle now going on is taking place primarily between two incompatible ideologies: the ideology of the working class, or Marxism-Leninism, and bourgeois ideology. Lenin stressed that "the only *choice* is—either bourgeois or socialist ideology. There is no middle course . . ." (*Coll. Works,* Vol. 5, p. 384). In present-day conditions, says Todor Zhivkov, First Secretary of the CC BCP, "the struggle between ideologies is gradually becoming a strategic bridgehead of the class struggle, of the duel between the two worlds".

Bourgeois ideology as a whole expresses and defends the interests of the capitalist class even though it is a medley of ideological currents. The social reason for this is, first of all, that the bourgeoisie as a class is not homogeneous and that the interests of its diverse components often clash. Secondly, lingering in contemporary capitalist society are survivals of the ideologies of former exploiting classes and there are ideological trends reflecting the interests and illusions of various intermediate, mostly petty-bourgeois strata. Among them are reformist currents intent on "improving capitalism".

The general pattern of the spiritual life of bourgeois society is thus composed of the struggle between proletarian and bourgeois ideology and of the relations existing between diverse bourgeois currents. Taken as a whole, it does not fit into the framework of a "competition of ideas" or a "contest of opinions" on an equal footing. Only ideological trends that do not endanger the domination of big capital have more or less identical opportunities for expansion under capitalism. True, the working people of many capitalist countries have won certain rights and freedoms, including the right to propagate Marxist ideology. *But it should be clear that the dominant ideology in these countries is* bourgeois. One has only to think of who in capitalist countries owns the printing plants, broadcasting, television, film studios and other mass media, and who is the real master of research institutions, universities and other centres "producing" ideas, to realise that Marxist ideology does not enjoy the same rights as its bourgeois counterpart.

Pluralists care least of all about furthering the influence of working-class ideology in capitalist society. The thesis about ideological "equality" is meant for a society rejecting bourgeois ideology.

But can there be "equal opportunities" in socialist society for propagating proletarian and bourgeois ideology?

Under developed socialism, due to radical changes in the social and political structure of society, Marxism-Leninism becomes the world outlook of the whole people. Being primarily the ideology of the chief motive power of socialist society, the working class, it also expresses the basic and long-range interests of other components of the new society—the class of co-operative peasants and handicraftsmen, the intellectuals and salary-earners. It is only remnants of exploiting classes and people caught in the meshes of imperialist propaganda that share bourgeois notions in one form or another and to varying degrees. In our society, this category has neither social support, nor the strength to bring into being any serious "movement" for the restoration of the former system. Incidentally, socialist democracy guarantees even this numerically insignificant group freedom of conscience and religion and other civil rights. Consequently, the issue of

"equal rights" for bourgeois ideology under socialism is irrelevant since there is no rea social basis for it.

The reason why pluralists seek "equal opportunities" for bourgeois ideology in socialist society is that they want to propagate the moral standards and habits of the bourgeois way of life. Their arguments are not prompted by concern for human rights but by the desire for the legalisation of unhampered export of the ideological output of imperialism to socialist countries.

---

[1] As used in contemporary bourgeois literature, pluralism denotes a multiplicity of political forces parties and ideological views. And this, the pluralists claim, is the classic model of bourgeoi democracy.

This article examines the views of bourgeois and reformist ideologists on the subject.

[2] The following are part of a longer list: U. Bermbach. Sozialistischer Pluralismus. Hamburg, 1973 E. Fraenkel. Reformismus und Pluralismus. Hamburg, 1973; R.K. Furtak. Interessen-pluralismus in den politischen Systemen Osteuropas. "Osteuropa", N 11-12, 1974; A. Korbonski. The Prospects for Change in Eastern Europe. "Slavic Review", N 2, 1974; F. Nuscheler, Pluralismus. Konzeptionen und Kontroversen. München, 1972; J.-F. Revel. Les promesses de l'euro-communisme. "L'Express" Paris, N 1301, 1975; S. S. Rosenfeld. Pluralism and Policy. "Foreign Affairs". N 2, 1974; O. Sik, Der dritte Weg. Hamburg, 1972; J. B. Urban. Socialist Pluralism in Soviet and Italian Communist Perspective: The Chilean Catalyst. "Orbis", Vol. XVIII, N 2, 1974.

[3] An analysis and criticism of ideological and political pluralism will be found in the following works among others: F. D. Mitev, "The Principles of Socialism and the Technique of Revisionist Criticism," Sofia 1974; V. E. Gulyev, E. L. Kuzmin, "The State and Democracy. A Critique of Anti-Marxist Theory", Moscow, 1975; The Struggle of Ideas in the World of Today, Vol. 1, Moscow 1975 Vol. 2, Moscow 1976; E. Fromm, K. Sokolowski, Zum Platz des Pluralismus in der gegenwärtigen bürgerlichen Ideologie. "Deutsche Zeitschrift für Philosophie". N 8, 1975; R. Bauermann, K. Geyer E. Julier, "Das Eland der 'Marxologie'," Berlin 1975; E. Wimmer, Demokratismus und Pluralismus "Weg und Ziel", Wien, N 4, 1973; W. Hollitscher. Bürokratismus und Pluralismus. "Weg und Ziel" Wien, N 4, 1974.

[4] One of its founders was William James, the author of "A Pluralistic Universe," N.Y. 1909.

[5] Popper. "The Open Society and Its Enemies". Vol. 2, London, 1957.

It is hardly necessary to prove that the monism of Marxist theory and methodology has nothing in common with the "unifactor" mechanist-determinist concept. It will be recalled, for instance, that in his correspondence of the 1890s Engels rejected all attempts to interpret Marxism in the spirit of economic determinism. Marxist methodology considers all the factors that influence the development of society, but rejects the pluralistic approach, which postulates the "equal value" of al factors without clearly assessing the role of each. Though Marxism does not deny that socia development is influenced by a complex multiformity of determinants, it singles out the mode o production and production relations as basic to the development of all social life.

[6] Pluralism has become a fashionable word and is used by bourgeois politicians and ideologists for different purposes. For instance, South Africa's Minister of Information and Internal Affairs Mulder recently suggested abandoning the term apartheid in favour of "pluralistic democracy" inasmuch, in his words, the former evokes negative and the latter positive emotions.

[7] See, for instance, K. Prewitt, A. Stone. "The Ruling Elites". New York-London, 1973; R Hamilton. "Class and Politics in the United States". New York, 1972, p. 45.

[8] See R. Dahl. "Pluralist Democracy in the United States: Conflict and Consent." Chicago, 1967 p. 5; R. Hamilton. "Class and Politics in the United States". New York, 1972.

[9] While stressing the class limitations of "pluralist democracy", we are far from ignoring the significance of the working people's general democratic struggle in bourgeois society. It is no indifferent to the working people of capitalist countries whether the political regime established in their country is an outspoken fascist dictatorship or a bourgeois democracy. The more democracy there is, the more opportunities the working class and the people have to defend their interests. While exposing bourgeois democracy as nominal, Marxists join efforts with other sincere defenders o democracy, including those who favour bourgeois political pluralism, in the struggle to defend and extend the working people's democratic rights and freedoms.

The New Internationalism

ANTONIO RUBBI

Central Committee member, Italian Communist Party

WE consider the discussion of internationalism begun in the working-class movement extremely interesting.

This is an exceptionally topical theme; its correct presentation—leaving aside arguments over definitions and epithets—can be of decisive importance in determining the position of the unprecedented broad front of diverse forces and the contribution it can make to a positive solution of the pressing problems now facing the entire world.

We hold the following proposition to be beyond doubt: internationalism is an objective necessity. Today more than ever before, the ideological orientation and political actions of the broad popular, democratic, progressive, left forces, the Communist and Workers' parties, cannot but take into account the multifaceted panorama of international life and the necessary obligations of international solidarity it imposes.

This necessity coincides with the growing understanding that the problems now agitating society in the various countries—from economic crisis to inflationary processes—cannot be correctly solved without substantially changing the international causes that are largely responsible for the emergence of these problems.

Today everyone is aware of these world-wide problems. They include, above all, the assurance of peace through a policy capable of containing and rolling back the forces of war and aggression, the forces of imperialism.

Further, they include detente, which in recent years had doubtlessly won important positions (in relation to Europe this refers primarily to the Helsinki Conference). But to become irreversible, detente has to provide solutions for the serious conflicts still persisting in the Middle East and Southern Africa; it must be backed by concrete steps to reduce the arms race, which has assumed exceedingly dangerous proportions, by concrete disarmament measures aimed at progressive and steady elimination of the confrontation of military blocs.

Lastly, they include a policy of liberation and self-determination of peoples. Today, after the long process of winning national independence in most former colonial and oppressed nations, this policy requires the establishment, in all spheres, of a new pattern of relations with the industrially more developed states. There is also the pressing need for multilateral international co-operation. Without it, the economic development of newly independent countries would be largely problematic; the industrially developed countries, too, would find themselves in difficulties, without markets for their goods. They would be faced with the none-too-distant prospect of reduced economic potentials, the undermining of democratic gains and cultural and social decline.

We should also reflect on the new problems that could acquire a dramatic character for the destinies of mankind unless urgent efforts were made to solve them. Reference is to eliminating the disproportion between developed and under-developed, between population growth and expansion of the zone of mass malnutrition, the destruction and damaging of the environment, the more frequent elemental calamities. Solution of all these problems requires reorganising international relations on a new basis, a new world economic and monetary system, a broad and co-ordinated programme of economic, scientific and technological research, renewal of structures and of national moral and cultural values.

Such, very largely, is the new content, we believe, of action on an international scale.

But there have been deep-going changes in international life, not only of an objective, but also of a subjective character.

There has been tremendous expansion of the zone of operation of the forces prepared to work for positive solution of these problems. It comprises the socialist countries, the non-

aligned states, the regions of liberation movements. The workers' and progressive movement includes, of course, the Communist parties, but it also absorbs numerous forces of Socialist and Social-Democratic orientation and of the Christian philosophy. *The working class remains the main force, but now within an unprecedentedly varied and broad range of other social forces.*

If there is to be the hope of successfully coping with these new realities of the world and its colossal problems, all these forces must have an active part in common efforts and co-ordinated initiatives.

If it is to be effective and able to direct world development towards peace and security, co-operation and progress, democratic development and social renewal, international solidarity cannot, in our time, abstract itself from the new content of the world situation and the new scope of the internationalist front.

What conditions are required for this tremendous potential to find its full expression? The answer is the possibility and ability to work out independently, absolutely independently, a policy attuned to the achievement of these great aims. And what can be our starting point, *if not the native ground on which these forces operate?* Internationalism must be linked with the cardinal problems facing the world, with due account of the requirements of national realities. Otherwise, it would have but one fate: it would degenerate into ineffectual propaganda unrelated even to concrete manifestations of solidarity, and would be distant and alien to the working class and the broad masses of working people.

We consider our ability to combine a policy reflecting the national interests of our country with a policy that never loses sight of the entire international picture and of the need to demonstrate, when necessary, effective solidarity, to be one of the stronger aspects of our policy, our political activity and the results achieved. Perhaps our actions have not been without error, or have been belated, but, we believe, it would be hard to question the consistency of this policy, aimed at unity of the national and international in the character of our Party; it would be hard to question our constant participation in events and the continuity of our obligations in respect of these two parts of unity.

Such a policy can be the fruit only of our own analysis, our own theoretical research and our own political action. *It must be expressed autonomously not only in resolving internal* problems, but also on our main international positions, in our country's foreign policy. Working out the fundamentals of a new policy for Italy and Western Europe, which imposes a tremendous responsibility on us, is, we believe, important not only as our contribution to the search for a way out of the crisis, liberation from hampering restraints and from the risk of finding ourselves in a subordinate position. It also opens to Italy and Western Europe the opportunity of forming new relations of co-operation and mutual advantage with the countries of Eastern Europe, the Arab world, the Mediterranean and the developing states. Italy and Western Europe could in this way become active forces in the policy of co-operation and progress and could facilitate the extension of detente and new international relations on our continent and the world.

Independence and autonomy are basic conditions for effective and fruitful *international* solidarity. If in Berlin the European Communist and Workers' parties were able to achieve a satisfactory identity of views on the great aims of peace, security, co-operation and social progress, it was because they recognised that the prerequisite and condition for the struggle in this direction was the pursuit "of a political line worked out and adopted by every Party in complete independence in accordance with the socio-economic and political conditions and the specific national features prevailing in the country concerned."

We shall continue to abide by this policy, for we believe that the biggest contribution a Party can make to internationalism is determined by what it does, independently and concretely in its own field of battle, to promote detente, new international relations and the independence and progress of the peoples.

Independent elaboration of problems and of political activity is also a necessary

condition for the continuing world struggle for socialism in the new international situation. It is true, of course, that not all the forces working for world peace, international co-operation and social progress are prepared immediately to join the battle for socialist transformations. That is true, though with the profound and complex crisis in many capitalist countries and with the new problems confronting states that have just won independence, there is taking shape a new alignment of social and political forces and a growing demand for democratic and socialist transformations. This is the reaction, at a *qualitatively higher* level of social development, to the cause of the crisis.

But this positive process is taking place in an age of deep changes in the socio-class structure of society which, of course, can no longer be characterised by the schematic division into "bourgeoisie" and "proletariat". These changes have found, and continue to find, their expression in the variegated and pluralistic systems of representative institutions and forms of democracy, ideological and philosophical trends, different political and social forces.

It is still true, of course, that the working class remains in the centre of this front of forces capable of renewing society and transforming it along socialist lines. For the working class, by virtue of its nature and purposeful struggle, is the most consistent fighter for this aim. But it is also true that other social forces are fighting together with it, especially in the developed capitalist countries: the peasants, middle strata, representatives of science, technology and culture. A pluralism of forces is to be observed also in countries that have recently won independence and in the national movements.

With the new scope of the movement developing in the world, we believe that the definition of internationalism as "proletarian" has become restrictive and does not accord with the new social reality. However, it is not a matter of definitions, but of substance. At the Berlin Conference we rose above this formula, because, objectively, it would have restricted the unitarian appeal the Communist and Workers' parties addressed to the political forces of the workers' and democratic movement, proposing a policy of rapprochement and co-operation on a national and European scale.

It is also true that in implementing the policy of democratic renewal and socialist transformations the Communist and Workers' parties play a leading role by virtue of their ideological orientation and action programme. However, the working class and social forces referred to above do not identify themselves only with the Communist parties. The workers' movement of today, particularly in Western Europe, includes diverse political trends, among them trends that are beyond the framework of the Communist parties, some even beyond the framework of Marxist-orientated parties. An understanding of the need for a qualitative change of the social structure, the demand for socialism, are growing also within other political trends. This is an important positive fact, a trend characteristic of our age, and we deem it our duty to do everything we can to bring this trend to reality.

In this situation, with all its new features and peculiarities, can we prescribe for the movement common and universal laws for developing the socialist revolution and building socialist society, divorced from the objective historical conditions in which all these forces operate? Should we not, on the contrary, work out a strategy for the advance to socialism which would accord with the conditions and requirements of the given society and would draw from it the principles of action and the choice of path?

We Italian Communists have put forth precisely this principle in Italy and Western Europe in order to find a way out of the capitalist crisis with a new development perspective. And we call on the broad working and popular masses, on the political forces of the communist, socialist, social-democratic and Christian orientations to become the main executors of this grand project of renewal and transformation. We are told that, compared with existing and real socialism, this project is so far pure hypothesis.

We are fully aware that the theoretical and political study of the ways to socialism in Italy and Western Europe is still far from completed. Concrete actions in the political and the struggle of the working masses have not yet produced results capable of changing the character of the system in which we operate. Besides, we realise that this task cannot be left

to us alone. On the contrary, the primary condition for the positive consummation of the work of restructuring society, which will assume a wide scope and will, of course, require much time, calls for close unity of will, effort and co-operation of all these different forces. Above all, it requires unity of the communist, socialist and social-democractic forces by overcoming the historical split, which for over half a century now has kept the West-European working class divided.

In saying all this, we realise also that our idea of socialism already has a solid practical heritage firmly engraved on people's minds. We can look back on more than 30 years of difficult and tenacious struggle of the democratic and popular forces; we have accumulated life-tested practice of unitarian administration over a considerable part of the country; also gains of great importance in assuring the democratic character of the country and in upholding the right of the popular masses to freedom and political participation. And, most important, our strategy meets with understanding among the masses, and that understanding grows as we bring our policy to the knowledge of new labouring strata, new generations, to the knowledge of the democratic and progressive forces participating in the country's life. And so, there are already gains that have become part of the broad and multiform process of transformations in the direction of socialism. We are working on the premise that the development of socialism in the world is a process that will proceed in different forms and will have a different content, and that there will emerge from this process societies differing from each other not only as socio-economic formations, but also as new systems of democratic institutions, as entities expressive of the new type of moral and ethical values.

The experience of socialist construction, with its record of achievement and its revealed shortcomings, is undoubtedly an important aspect of this process. It is a big contribution, both by virtue of its influence in changing international factors, thus creating new and more faviourable conditions for the struggle of the international workers' movement, and by virtue of its important economic, social and civil transformations and gains, which extend to such a substantial part of our planet.

We realise that this process requires fresh experience.

In view of the concrete historical conditions of the working-class movement in Western Europe, we feel that we can and should bring into this general process our own experience, in which the creation of the material foundations of socialist society are accompanied by the further development of democracy, in which man's liberation from exploitation involves maximum development of his rights and freedoms; in which social, political, cultural and ideological pluralism stemming from the very history of these countries, would not only be guaranteed, but would be enriched with new moral and spiritual values. In our own and other West European countries the demand for socialism includes this content and we must be able to express it in our strategy and in our concrete programmes of political action.

When we so persistently raise the question of independence and autonomy in working out strategy and practical policies within the workers' movement, including the struggle for socialism, we have no intention whatever of contrasting the "national" to the "international". On the contrary, we are convinced that only by following this path can we satisfy the requirements of our country, our workers and our people, and, at the same time—precisely in this way—make our maximum contribution to the general process of advancing world socialism.

Hence we have no intention of confining ourselves to a narrow national framework, in which there would be very little opportunity to solve the problems confronting our country. What we advocate is new internationalism, which essentially implies the need for new relations based on recognition of the autonomy and equality of each party as set out in the final document of the European Conference of Communist and Workers' Parties.

We are likewise convinced that precisely this path will lead to a correct understanding of the causes of multiplicity in the international workers' movement, and on the basis of this understanding we can go over, through the necessary efforts in theoretical and political renewal, to a new and higher level of unity.

Reality Versus Illusions

Correspondence with Readers

N. R. Mendez, writing from Miami Beach, Fla., USA, takes exception to certain conclusions drawn by J. Encarnacion Perez in "The Freedom Mexico Needs" (WMR, *July 1976).*

"The writer adopts an unscientific stand with respect to Mexico's government," N. R. Mendez maintains. "The present Mexican government, considering both the current international situation, and the historical moment, is quite visibly a progressive, left-of-centre government. It has taken progressive stands internationally, as with respect to the Third World, Chile, the socialist bloc, and US imperialism, and domestically it has also assumed progressive positions. Among these are amnesty to Communists and other political prisoners.

For this, it has been attacked both domestically and internationally. . . . Letters have appeared recently in newspapers like The New York Times, *in which a group of imperialist senators 'warns' about Mexico's left turn, and asks for an intervention to prevent 'another Cuba'. It should be clear that while the Mexican CP position cannot be one of surrendering its independence as a party and of voicing uncritical support for the government, it cannot either adopt the position of 'deny this government all support', as Preez says."*

Following is an answer to the American reader from Samuel Melendrez, representative of the Mexican Communist Party on the journal.

OBSERVERS whose knowledge of Mexican reality is adequate and who do not look into the substance of the social and political situation in Mexico today and take into account above all certain aspects of the government's foreign policy, can easily fall into error in assessing it. N. R. Mendez's letter is a case in point. Disagreeing with J. Encarnacion Perez, he describes the Echeverria government as "progressive, left-of-centre". His main argument in support of this definition is Mexico's foreign policy.

Echeverria came to power in 1970, when the international situation necessitated a new foreign policy. I am alluding to the economic crisis affecting the capitalist system, the reverses of US imperialist policy, primarily its defeat in Vietnam, the Watergate affair and Nixon's ignominious resignation. Development in Latin America at the time was highlighted by the consolidation of the gains of the Cuban revolution, the victory of Popular Unity in Chile, the OAS crisis and Latin America's active participation in international forums of non-aligned countries. The growing might of the socialist community, especially in the economic and military fields, and their wise policy of peaceful coexistence made for more durable world peace and international detente. A new balance of forces had taken shape in the world, and the world itself had changed.

Could the Mexican bourgeoisie discount those new conditions? Of course not, primarily because in late years it had been hit by a severe social and political crisis. Mexican diplomacy roused from the lethargy that had marked it for decades during which it had trailed behind the US cold war policy. Pragmatism compelled the domestic bourgeoisie to revise its foreign policy.

Today every state which considers itself sovereign (whatever its character) has diplomatic relations with socialist countries or seeks contacts with them in other fields. Time was when maintaining relations with socialist countries seemed to be something extraordinary. Today this is an inevitable component of the foreign policy of many governments. The fact that various governments promote relations with socialist countries is a positive phenomenon, of course, but it does not *per se* make these governments progressive. Even the worst reactionaries are compelled to reckon with

world trends of social development, with the requirements of the times.

Now in spite of extremely favourable international conditions and very attractive proposals made to Mexico by socialist countries, the Echeverria government has taken no real steps of any considerable significance, for all the official fuss, to improve trade with them. This is confirmed by official data: in 1975, Mexico's imports were worth $6,580,200,000 and its exports, $2,858,600,000 (the US accounting for almost 60 per cent of the turnover). In the same period, imports from socialist countries made up a modest $35.8m. and exports, $68.2m.

In the light of the foregoing, how can the US senators' "warning" about Mexico's "left turn" be taken seriously? True, the government has signed a few protocols with the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance in recent months and has announced (as many times before) that, at long last, it would normalise trade with the CMEA. On December 1, 1976, the new President was inaugurated, but the crisis caused by the devaluation of the peso and the deterioration of the domestic political situation gives serious reasons to doubt that this will materialise during his term in office, too. As for the Communists and other democrats, they earnestly insist on carrying it into practice.

The Echeverria government has made a number of constructive foreign policy moves we welcome. Its negative attitude to the Chilean fascist junta is known all over the world, and so is Mexico's aid to Chilean democrats. The government has backed Cuba and insisted on the OAS renouncing its disgraceful sanctions against Cuba. It has identified itself with those who are fighting for the restoration of democracy in Spain, proposed to adopt a Charter of the Economic Rights and Duties of States, and so on. While these moves are highly important politically, above all to Latin America's peoples, they do not prove that the government's foreign policy is genuinely independent. Mexico has formally refused to become a full-fledged participant in the movement of non-aligned countries and only sends an "observer" to its conferences. Although some members of OPEC wish Mexico to join the organisation, it has not done so. While giving a warm welcome to Communist, Socialist or MIRist exiles from Chile, the Mexican authorities persecute Communists and other revolutionaries coming from neighbouring Guatemala. The government declared its solidarity with the PLO, voted in the UN for a motion condemning Zionism and then made a volteface by supporting "protests" from the Israeli government and US Zionists. It has officially accepted the false concept of "two imperialisms", and so on.

As far as its constructive actions are concerned, our Party welcomes them, for they are in keeping with its programme provisions and the demands of other democratic forces of Mexico. They are a contribution to the struggle for international detente, co-operation and solidarity. "The Mexican people's solidarity with fraternal peoples helps the country to adopt constructive foreign policy positions," says the Declaration of the Conference of Communist Parties of Latin America and the Caribbean. On the other hand, the Communist Party strongly criticises the weaknesses and inconsistencies of the government's policy.

The anti-popular nature of the government is particularly marked in the economic field. Without repeating arguments given in Encarnacion Perez's article, I would like to comment on three recent devaluations of the peso, which N. R. Mendez says are mere rumour. For 22 years, the US dollar was worth 12.50 pesos. After the third devaluation carried out at the end of November it equals 28 pesos.

Devaluation in the capitalist world admittedly leads to lower wages. It leads to the bankruptcy of small and medium-size enterprises, brings major enterprises bigger profits and strengthens the monopolies' hand. In Mexico, devaluation also implies an increase in the foreign debt (which is close to $25,000m.); it makes the country more dependent and threatens to put it entirely under the control of the US-dominated International Monetary Fund.

A direct consequence of devaluation is growing prices (up to 60 per cent) for certain consumer goods. But the regime does nothing to ease the people's condition. And while

the wages of workers belonging to pro-government trade unions have risen by almost 23 per cent, there has been no increase for millions of other workers. What is done to stop the outflow of foreign exchange? Is there any price control? Has any progressive tax been imposed on the earnings of domestic and foreign monopolies? Do small and medium businesses get any help? Do wage increases keep pace with rising prices? Not at all. It was only at the very end of November that the government introduced limited control over exchange to prevent a massive currency outflow.

The Central Committee of our Party has described the devaluation of the peso as follows: "It is not merely a financial measure but evidence of the failure of a definite policy based on financing investments with the aid of foreign credits, a policy of industrialisation, based on imported plant and equipment, to produce consumer goods for the privileged, a policy stimulating the accumulation of capital through ruthless exploitation of the working people to enrich a handful of big capitalists." Summing up Echeverria's Presidency, the CC MCP stated: "The past six years have been a period of the slowest development in the last 40 years, the most unbridled inflation and the highest national debt.... Thus they have also been a period of increasing dependence, impoverishment of the working people, unscrupulous exploitation of the working class and mounting unemployment. The result is that while bankers' profits have grown by 150 per cent, four in every ten able-bodied Mexicans are doomed to unemployment or semi-unemployment."

It follows that devaluation is a product of the disastrous economic policy pursued with such persistence over the past six years. Responsibility for it falls on the government and, in view of the nature of Mexico's political system, on President Echeverria. In these circumstances, how can anyone exhort the working people to trust a regime which treats them so brutally? Considering the support given by the President to the pro-government trade unions—comparable only to the Franco unions—such an exhortation would be an irreparable mistake for which the working-class movement of Mexico would have to pay dearly, both now and in the future.

The US senators' alarm at "Mexico's left turn" is bluff aimed at securing new advantages for the Mexican bourgeoisie and its government. The hue and cry was raised, understandably enough, when presidential authority was about to change hands in both countries.

As for the partial amnesty mentioned by N. R. Mendez, it should be noted that it only applied to persons whose cases were still under examination. Hundreds of political prisoners charged with guerrilla activities are still in jail. So are hundreds of people kidnapped by the police or the army and presumably being held in barracks. This is why we demand a general amnesty and an end to repression.

Such are the facts, assessed in the light of "the current international situation and the historical moment," as our correspondent suggests. In view of the outlook for the struggle of the working class, our Party, which adheres to a class, socialist position, certainly cannot give "critical support" (as N. R. Mendez apparently suggests) to a government whose policy serves the interests of a big bourgeoisie linked with and subservient to foreign monopolies. Indeed, the Party's duty is to call on the working people to fight for our programme of radical democratic and socialist changes, for Mexican society is ripe for this.

What I have said does not rule out the possibility of agreement in the interest of united action (given definite political conditions) with this or that section of the bourgeoisie or even with the government or part of it as the policy of alliance is implemented. Some of our views, primarily those on foreign policy issues, coincided with President Echeverria's. But that was probably as far as it went, for the government flatly refused to effect the social and political changes that the people demand ever more emphatically.

In an appeal to the *workers, peasants, students, academics, small and medium businessmen and industrialists*, the CC MCP formulates the aims of the struggle against the effects of devaluation and the policy imposed by political and financial interests.

Our anti-monopoly programme points out that "the measures which can be carried out even today are not ultimate goals of the working class, the peasants, and the exploited people. The measures that can be adopted in Mexico do not lead to socialism, do not go beyond the framework of capitalism. It is essential that the burden of the economic crisis is not shouldered by the working people . . . that mobilisation and struggle should enable the masses to influence government policy. . . . These demands are not advanced by the working people alone. Every government striving to overcome the crisis on a sound basis should reckon with them. However, it can do so only if it breaks with domestic and foreign monopolies."

It is manifest that this programme proceeds from a realistic estimation of the moment, and first of all, from the existing balance of class forces, that it puts forward urgent problems of Mexican society and that the most diverse class forces can unite in struggle for their solution.

The political initiative should be held by the working-class vanguard, that is, by the Party, which retains its political independence. We cannot bring this about if we wait to see how the bourgeoisie acts in this or that situation and shape our policy accordingly. It is these criteria based on the experience of the international working-class movement that guide our Party.

I would like the writer of the letter to reflect on what I have said about the complicated situation in Mexico.

Samuel Melendrez
CC member, Mexican Communist Party

November 1976

Theoretical Conference in Berlin

"INTERACTION of the socialist countries' economic and political system at the present stage", was the subject of a theoretical conference held in Berlin in November. Sponsored by *World Marxist Review* in co-operation with the Central Committee of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany. it was attended by scholars from Bulgaria, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, the GDR, Hungary, Mongolia, Poland, Rumania and the Soviet Union.

The Conference was opened by Hannes Höring, member of the SUPG Central Committee and head of its Science Department. He welcomed the participants on behalf of the SUPG Central Committee and its General Secretary, Erich Honecker.

The Editor-in-Chief of *World Marxist Review*, Konstantin Zarodov, Dr. Hist., delivered a report on the methodological problems involved in studying the interrelation of economics and politics at the present stage, analysis of the socialist community's experience in perfecting the scientific management of society and production, and the international aspects of economics and politics.

In the ensuing discussion, speakers noted the theoretical and practical importance of the problem for socialist and communist construction and for attaining the goals set by the Congresses of fraternal parties in socialist countries.

The discussion was summed up by Professor Otto Reinhold, member of the SUPG Central Committee and Director of its Institute of Social Sciences. He emphasised that the discussion covered a wide range of problems, from the building of the material and technical basis to unity of social and economic policy. The discussion, he said, reflected a new stage in building developed socialism, with new qualitative features in the intertwining and interaction of various spheres of social life.

A survey of the conference will appear in an early issue of *WMR*.

Dangerous Myths

On Some Cold War Concepts

STEPAN MOKSHIN
Soviet Historian

DETENTE remains an object of ideological struggle. Imperialist reaction does much to minimise the importance of detente, misinterpret it or create the impression that it cannot last.

The enemies of peace and detente, who express the interests of military industrial circles and reactionary, revanchist and neocolonialist alignments, are trying to slow down or even torpedo detente. They want the governments of leading capitalist countries to renounce talks on disputed issues and fall back on the "positions of strength" policy towards socialist countries. George Ball, former US Under Secretary of State, thinks detente lulls the capitalist West although he still hopes it will help to pierce at least "miniscule holes" in the "iron curtain."[1] The American trade union boss, George Meany, has condemned the Helsinki documents and accused the US President of "appeasement".[2] Margaret Thatcher, the British Conservative leader, has called on the government to follow a "position of strength" policy.[3]

Some capitalist leaders, the press points out, betray a tendency towards revising the policy of detente. "Detente," *Fortune* magazine wrote, "assumed that we had a real capability of altering Soviet objective."[4] And since this has not come about, said Manfred Wörner, a CDU/CSU leader, speaking to the Bundestag, the West needs a revision of the concept of detente."[5]

Imperialist propaganda spreads numerous myths aimed at discrediting world socialism, the Communist and Workers' parties and their struggle for peace, security and social progress. I will mention some of them.

Myth of the "Soviet military threat" to the capitalist West. Anti-communist strategists distort the foreign policy of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries and, contrary to common sense, accuse them of aspiring to "world supremacy" and trying to interfere in the affairs of other countries. In 1975 James Schlesinger, then US Secretary of Defence, assured legislators, with reference to "secret data" collected by the CIA and military intelligence, that the Soviet Union spent 50 per cent more on defence than the United States. No sooner had Donald Rumsfeld succeeded him than the CIA supplied him with false information, alleging that Soviet military expenditures added up to an annual $200,000m., or roughly 150,000m. roubles, and were going up by three or more per cent a year. The Defence Secretary did not seem to be interested in the well-known fact that the Soviet national income in 1975 amounted to 362,000m. roubles and that over 80 per cent of this sum was spent for raising the standard of living. What he thinks important is to frighten the population of capitalist countries.

Alexander Haig, NATO commander-in-chief, echoes the head of the Pentagon. Asked by *Der Spiegel* with provocative intent whether it was true that 19,000 tanks and 58 divisions of the Eastern bloc were poised for a surprise attack on the West while NATO garrisons spent carefree "long weekends", the general voiced with a serious mien "genuine concern about the growing Soviet capability to launch a surprise attack."[6]

Shameless lies like these are picked up by the capitalist media and spread all over the world. Behind the smokescreen of myths about the "Soviet threat", the imperialists step up the arms race; high-ranking leaders of NATO countries discuss ways and means of modernising nuclear weapons and lay plans for nuclear war against the Soviet Union and its Warsaw Treaty allies.

Washington is seriously considering the new strategic concept of "limited nuclear war".

The *Washington Post* questioned the wisdom of this strategy, saying that there was no such thing as a small nuclear war. During the presidential election campaign, President-elect Carter, for his part, described the idea of a limited nuclear war as foolish.

The allegations about the "Soviet threat" are refuted by many realistic-minded people in the capitalist West. Senator William Proxmire (D.), Chairman of the US Congress Subcommittee on Priorities and Economy in Government, once said that the Pentagon was distorting and exaggerating intelligence estimates about the size of the Soviet military programme to secure record arms appropriations.[7]

However, sober voices like this are drowned by the bellicose mouthings of those whose thinking bears a cold war imprint. Imperialist ideologists ignore realities, yet a look at these realities would be enough to explode the myth of the "Soviet military threat" and Soviet "plans of aggression".

The Berlin Conference of European Communist and Workers' Parties noted that the stepped-up arms race and the stockpiling of armaments "pose a direct threat to peace, security and co-operation between states and block the realisation of the European peoples' aspirations for independence and progress."

"It is imperative," the recent World Conference to End the Arms Race, for Disarmament and Detente stressed, "to enhance the international public's awareness of disarmament problems."[8] The conference adopted a detailed action plan to spell out to the general public in all countries the intricate problems of disarmament, the connection between detente and discontinuance of the arms race, and ways and means of complementing political with military detente.

Myth of socialism as a "closed society". The capitalist press claims that the Soviet Union and other socialist countries have set up a "new iron curtain" to isolate their people from the rest of the world. Alfred Dregger, a CDU/CSU member of the Bundestag, affirms that the main subject of the capitalist powers' entire postwar policy has been the "conflict between legal democracy and Communist dictatorship."[9] The US Congress has even resolved to appoint a committee to ascertain how the Soviet Union implements the Helsinki agreements. Opponents of detente describe this kind of interference in the affairs of a foreign country as a mechanism making it possible to find out why Soviet policy was not "substantially liberalised" after Helsinki.

What sort of "liberalisation" are these ideologists of imperialism talking about? In *Ideology and the Ideologists*, Professor Lewis Feuer, a sociologist, expresses the hope that a relaxation of international tensions will provide a more solid basis for "deideologising" Soviet society.[10] Various "Eastern policy experts" declare for a detente conducive to stronger ideological penetration into the socialist countries to undermine their unity.

The sponsors of this propaganda campaign hope against hope that socialism can be "eroded" from within, turned into a "pluralist political organism" and made to "evolve" towards capitalism. Karl Kaiser, a West German economist and sociologist, sees "the purpose of the policy of detente... in a convergence that will gradually transform the opposed systems."[11] The idea is, obviously, to pave the way for ideological penetration into socialist coutries and for the ideological "convergence of the two systems".

The Soviet Union and other socialist countries advocate greater cultural co-operation between countries with different social systems, more contacts between individuals and nations. The Soviet Union maintains cultural relations with 120 countries and participates in the activities of more than 250 international cultural organisations. Over 7,000 Soviet cultural workers go abroad every year and roughly as many foreign scientists, actors, writers and artists visit the Soviet Union. In accordance with the Helsinki Final Act, the Soviet Union has taken further steps to increase exchanges of books, films and works of art. Britain and France, for example, publish six or seven times less books by Soviet authors than the other way round. The situation is much the same in the case of films and TV programmes. Contacts betseen people have expanded lately. In 1975 alone, over 58 million foreign guests visited the CMEA countries and over 35 million citizens of socialist countries went abroad. The Soviet Union last year played host to 980

foreign trade union and workers' delegations, and 750 delegations of Soviet workers visited other countries. Some of the latter trips met with hurdles. In particular, the US authorities have repeatedly refused entry visas to Soviet trade union delegations invited by American unions.

Speaking to the Berlin Conference of European Communist and Workers' Parties, Leonid Brezhnev, General Secretary of the CC CPSU, said: "... The socialist countries are not a 'closed society'. We are open to everything that is truthful and decent, and are prepared to multiply contacts in every way, making the most of the congenial conditions created by detente. But our doors will always be closed to publications advocating war, violence, racism and hatred of man, and doubly so to emissaries of foreign secret services and the anti-Soviet emigre organisations they have created. ... We are not afflicted by spy mania. But neither shall we afford freedom for subversive acts against our system, against our society."

Myth of the incompatibility of the class struggle and detente. Peace opponents ascribe all their setbacks to detente. They blame peaceful coexistence for the deep crisis of capitalist society, the growing influence of democratic forces in Western Europe, the overthrow of the fascist dictatorship in Portugal and the "black colonels" regime in Greece, the defeat of the invaders and reactionary regimes in Indochina and of the colonialists and neocolonialists in Angola. To adapt detente to the class aims of capitalism, anti-communist and anti-Soviet strategists would like peaceful coexistence to be an "ideological compromise" between the two social systems. This is why they talk more and more often of a social status quo without which, they say, the policy of peaceful coexistence is meaningless. They contend that the Soviet Union takes advantage of detente to "undermine" the social order in Western countries. Examining the so-called "dangers posed by the policy of detente", Richard Löwenthal, professor of international politics at the University of West Berlin and Columbia University, claims that in "Soviet political practice", the effort to preserve detente is coupled with "offensive actions ... on the periphery of the West and in the third world."[12] Critics of detente "warn" the Soviet Union against counting on detente should it step up the class struggle.

U.S. News & World Report comments that there will be "either greater give on the part of the Kremlin, or a hardening of American policy toward Russia".[13] Opponents of peaceful coexistence declare that unless the Soviet Union shows restraint and moderation in the third world, relations in the spirit of detente will be impaired. Even the *Christian Science Monitor* writes that this kind of comment is untenablle, for there is nothing in Soviet-American agreements or in documents about detente making detente conditional on the socialist countries' refusal to support national liberation movements.[14]

The obvious purpose of utterances against detente is to suggest to the masses that detente and the class and national liberation struggle are incompatible. The 25th CPSU Congress dealt with these arguments of capitalist propaganda. "This," the Congress stated, "is either outright naivety or more likely a deliberate befuddling of minds. It could not be clearer, after all, that detente and peaceful coexistence have to do with interstate relations. This means above all that disputes and conflicts between countries are not to be settled by war, by the use or threat of force. Detente does not in the slightest abolish, nor can it abolish or alter, the laws of the class struggle. No one should expect that because of detente Communists will reconcile themselves with capitalist exploitation or that monopolists will become followers of the revolution. On the other hand, strict observance of the principle of non-interference in the affairs of other states and respect for their independence and sovereignty, are one of the essential conditions of detente."

Experience shows that imperialism has no intention of upholding any "status quo" in the class struggle and wants no "ideological compromise". Indeed, it uses the most sophisticated methods and powerful mass media in its psychological war against socialism and progress, *first*, to prevent the spread of communist ideas in capitalist countries and undermine the social basis for detente there, *second*, to loosen international solidarity and split the front against reaction and the war danger uniting world socialism, the

international working class and national liberation forces, and *third*, to divert the attention of the working people of capitalist countries from the crisis of the capitalist system and from the struggle to change that system.

The Communists, who champion the revolutionary replacement of capitalism by socialism, consider that the policy of peaceful coexistence and international detente provides the most favourable conditions for the working class and other progressive forces to persevere in their struggle.

Myth of "Eurocommunism" and "West European exclusiveness". The Communists' Berlin forum alarmed the imperialists. Their media resort to various falsehoods, alleging, in particular, that some parties had to make "concessions" while others scored "gains". One is struck by the effect to prove that communism in Europe has an East European and a West European variety, now labelled "Eurocommunism".

There is nothing new in the pseudo-theoretical arguments used. In the early sixties, capitalist propaganda counterposed the concept of "humane", "democratic" socialism to Marxist-Leninist, scientific socialism, insisting that the Soviet model of socialism was "outdated and dogmatic" and calling for new ("developed", "Western", "national", etc.) models.

Asked by *Der Kurier* whether he was a "Eurocommunist", Franz Muhri, Chairman of the Communist Party of Austria, answered that the notion was not a Communist invention. If "Eurocommunism" implied a common West European model of socialism, Austria's Communists rejected the idea. They say that there can be neither a Soviet, nor a common West European model. Socialism in each country must be determined by the general principles of socialism with due regard to specific national features.

Knud Jespersen, Chairman of the Communist Party of Denmark, refuted allegations about the various parties' "concessions" and "gains", dismissing these claims of the capitalist press as "sheer nonsense". Actually, he said, "the 29 independent parties achieved unity as a result of talks over a long period, without any diktat or defeat whatever. The victors were 29 million Communists, who put forward new initatives and gave new impetus to the struggle. The enemies talked about subordination whereas all Communist parties, including that of the Soviet Union, stress independence and none seeks a central position."[15]

Having deluded themselves into expecting a split in the Communist movement, anti-Communist strategists plainly under-rated the Communist parties' common approach to fundamental contemporary issues, their class solidarity and their readiness, stated by them at the Berlin Conference, to "develop their internationalist, comradely and voluntary co-operation and solidarity on the basis of the great ideas of Marx, Engels and Lenin."

This internationalist solidarity, which the Communists have upheld for over 100 years remains a powerful and tested weapon of all Marxists-Leninists in the struggle for communist ideals.

These, then, are in rough outline some of the myths hatched by imperialist ideologists They indicate that the activity of opponents of peace and detente is still dangerous. There are still seats of war on the globe, and war preparations are continuing and even gaining in intensity. The Communists realise that in these circumstances, one of the fundamental objectives of sustained ideological effort by Marxists-Leninists is to analyse and expose the ideological positions of imperialism.

---

[1] George Ball, "The Summit Is a Western Defeat", *Newsweek*, August 11, 1975.
[2] *Daily World*, October 4, 1975.
[3] *The Times*, August 2, 1976.
[4] *Fortune*, April 1976.
[5] See *Deutsche Volkszeitung*, January 22, 1976.
[6] *Der Spiegel*, August 16, 1976.
[7] See *International Herald Tribune*, October 28, 1975.
[8] World Conference to End the Arms Race, for Disarmament and Detente. (Helsinki, Septemb[er] 23-26, 1976.) V. Public Opinion and the Struggle for Disarmament in Conditions of Detente.

[9] See *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung*, January 16, 1976.
[10] See Lewis Feuer, *Ideology and the Ideologists*. Oxford, 1975.
[11] Karl Kaiser, *Die europaische Herausforderung und die USA*. Munich, 1973, pp. 112-113.
[12] *Die Zeit*, April 9, 1976.
[13] *US News & World Report*, January 5, 1976.
[14] See *The Christian Science Monitor*, weekly International Edition, December 22, 1975.
[15] *Land og Folk*, July 2, 1976.

The Experience of Yesterday, the Lessons of Today

"A memzetközi munkamozgalon törtenete. 1945-1974". Budapest, Kossuth könyvkiado, 1975. 558 pp.

THE postwar experience accumulated by the working class and its parties is the subject of this study, "History of the International Workers' Movement, 1945-74", compiled by a team of researchers of the Hungarian Socialist Workers' Party Higher Political School.

The starting point of all these changes was the victory of the anti-fascist coalition over Hitlerism. It opened the road for the steady and swift advance of the socialist, democratic and anti-imperialist forces. The Soviet Union played the outstanding part in this. And not only because it bore the brunt of the struggle, but also because of its internationalist policy, which accorded with the interests of the peoples. The first land of socialism devoted all its strength to defeating the aggressor, but was also able to curb the reactionary propensities of some members of the anti-Hitler coalition. It was the Soviet Union that assured the complete rout of reaction and fascism. This was bought at the price of titanic effort and millions of lives.

In the ensuing years, too, the CPSU and the Soviet government guided by their internationalist policy, rendered immense political, economic, diplomatic and, when necessary, also military assistance to countries committed to national independence and social progress. Thus, in the early postwar years, when imperialism used economic blockade and all manner of subversion to prevent the socialist development of these countries, and also in the anti-imperialist, liberation wars of the Korean and Vietnamese peoples and in the people's struggles in Asia, Africa and Latin America, there was always reliable support and assistance from the USSR.

The weakening of imperialism and the successes of world socialism and of the national-liberation movement were facilitated also by the solidarity and support of the working class in developed capitalist countries.

Much of the book is devoted to an analysis of the various forms of revolutionary transition from capitalism to socialism during and after the Second World War.

In a number of countries popular fronts were established even before the war was over. These were broad coalitions comprising Communists, Social-Democrats, peasant and middle-bourgeois parties. After the war, largely due to the consistent popular front policy, and the alliance of the working class and the broad masses, the socialist revolution triumphed in some Central and South-European countries as a result of peaceful development. There arose a new form of revolutionary power, people's democracy, a form of proletarian dictatorship.

Subsequently, with the collapse of the colonial system and the triumph of national-liberation revolutions, there emerged socialist-oriented states. The exploration of new ways and possibilities of overthrowing the power of the monopoly bourgeoisie continued also in the developed capitalist countries.

Of course, this search for forms of transition to socialism is determined by objective and

subjective factors, by the historically-formed social and economic conditions of each country. But the decisive factor was the very existence of the Soviet Union and the socialist world system, the work of the Communist parties, their individual and collective efforts in analysing the new historical conditions and theoretically generalising experience and working out a political line.

By examining the documents of fraternal parties, the authors trace the rise and development of Communist strategy and tactics. And they cogently prove that a correct understanding of such problems as strengthening the unity of the anti-imperialist front, peaceful and non-peaceful transition to socialism, the relation between common development laws and national peculiarities in building the new society, is possible only from Marxist-Leninist positions. In this context, they emphasise the importance of creatively applying theory and of consistent and resolute struggle against right and "left" revisionist views, against anti-Sovietism and anti-communism in whatever forms they surface.

The history of the past three decades, the authors say, convincingly confirms the correctness of Lenin's idea that the peoples will arrive at socialism by different roads. It shows also the need to reckon with concrete conditions and peculiarities in the development of one or another country. At the same time, however—and this has been conclusively proven by experience—exaggerating national peculiarities, deviation from Marxist-Leninist principles, disregard, or even the slightest underestimation of common development laws can cause socialism immense harm. In this context, the authors stress the fundamental significance of the experience of the Soviet Union and the CPSU, upon which devolves the biggest responsibility in the fight for peace and socialism.

Balint Szabo

Argentina, Developed or Underdeveloped?

Mauricio Lebedinsky. "La Argentina. El pais que tenemos los cambias que necesitamos". Editorial Cartago. Buenos Aires. 1975. 109 pp.

TO find one's way through the present tangled political situation in Argentina, one has to have a realistic picture of its social and economic structure, which largely determines the role of the various social groups in the fight for national liberation. The economy of this vast South American country has a number of specific and contradictory features that hamper sociological analysis. Yet such a comprehensive analysis is of vital importance in charting the strategy and tactics of the revolutionary struggle, setting its immediate and ultimate aims and defining our policy of alliances. That is all the more necessary at this crucial stage in Argentina's history. One can therefore only welcome the appearance of this study, polemical in tone, by Argentina Communist economist Mauricio Lebedinsky, "Argentina: The country We Have and the Changes It Needs".

The book appeared at a grim time, in the days preceding the coup of March 24, 1976, which overthrew President Maria Peron together with the venal group of extreme right Peronists, and placed the country under a military regime heterogeneous in its composition. But the book has lost none of its topical interest for it examines cardinal problems and indicates realistic ways out of the crisis.

Lebedinsky's study falls into two parts. In the first, he examines the basic elements of the socio-economic structure. He gives a terse historical survey of Argentina's development, its demographic problems, the composition of its gainfully employed population and the distribution of income among its various groups. He deals in some detail with the development of industry and the degree of its concentration, the country's

energy resources and its foreign trade. There is also an analysis of the agricultural structure and the distinctive features of agricultural production, the reasons for its backwardness and the social and economic consequences thereof. He exposes the sinister role of the multinationals and of foreign monopoly penetration (pp. 37-39; 69-70).

The author wisely avoids a schematic and one-sided picture of Argentine reality and counsels against exaggerated assessments of its economic development. Classing Argentina with the developed capitalist countries, he remarks, would lead to an erroneous assessment of the alignment of class forces. Argentina, as presented in this study, is a country stymied by dependence on the monopolies and the latifundists. Convincing facts are cited to show that in terms of heavy industry Argentina is way behind other capitalist countries (pp. 64-65). Some might be taken in by the official data that Argentina has more doctors per thousand of the population than Canada, and more cinema seats than the United States. But these data do not, of course, provide anything resembling the real state of affairs in public health and culture.

Lebedinsky also warns against underestimating Argentina's economic development. If we see only the backwardness, he writes, and overlook the fact that, due to specific development conditions, natural resources and early entrance into the world market, capitalist relations have reached a considerable degree of development. Overlooking that would militate against correctly assessing the political role of the working class, the middle strata and the national bourgeoisie.

The theme of the second part of the book is "how to place the country on the road to a promising future", and that, the author says, will require mobilisation of the masses to fight for such a future, with the proletariat playing the leading role (p. 109). The alliance of such powerful enemies as the monopolists and latifundists can be defeated only if there is a broad progressive coalition of civilian and military elements, which would involve also patriotic elements of the Church, political parties and other social forces (p. 109). The policy of alliances is meant to produce such a broad front uniting all the democratic forces, including representatives of the army who share the sentiments of the people.

Lebedinsky has brought together a wealth of factual material and draws on a wide range of sources. His book should be required reading for everyone interested in the problems of Latin America.

Arturo Lozza

Century of Great Revolutions

Valter Roman, *Secolul XX, secolul marilor revolutii* (Twentieth Century: A Century of Great Revolutions), Bucharest, Editura Academiei R.S.R., 1976, 539 pp.

OURS is a century of unprecedented progress in every field of human activity. As we know, progress, or gradual quantitative growth, at a certain point produces fundamental qualitative changes, a leap in development. The depth and scale of the qualitative changes taking place in this century in the productive forces and production relations, politics, the social sphere, science and technology, and the relationship between man and nature, make it a century of great revolutions.

It is in this light that Valter Roman, a noted analyst of the social effects of the scientific and technological revolution (STR), views the twentieth century.[1] Nor is his estimation exaggerated. The twentieth century is, first and foremost, an epoch of the greatest social revolutions ushered in by the Great October Socialist Revolution, which laid the foundations of the complete and final abolition of all exploitation of man by man. However, the author stresses that, historically speaking, the October Revolution did not come like a bolt from the blue. The way for it was paved by progress in every social sphere

over a long period, primarily by a growth of the productive forces. Thus the construction of socialist society and then the transition to its higher phase, communism, became an immediate task for the masses as makers of history.

The book under review looks into the interconnection and interdependence of revolutionary changes in various social spheres. Its purpose is not to give an account of man's historical progress but rather a socio-philosophical outline of twentieth-century civilisation. I would like to call the reader's attention to the sections concerning the relationship between the STR and the socialist revolution, the application of achievements of the STR as an arena of the historic competition between socialism and capitalism, and some new aspects of today's class struggle. The section dealing with the elaboration of the Marxist theory of the STR deserves special attention.

Dialectical and historical materialism, the science founded by Marx and Engels and carried forward by Lenin, is a dependable guide in analysing the above problems. It is Marxism that has revealed the revolutionary role of the productive forces as the starting point of social development. The book discusses which productive forces should be regarded as typical of socialist society. Indeed, every mode of production and every socio-economic formation has so far been characterised by a definite level of technical development. Marx wrote that the "handmill gives you society with the feudal lord; the steammill, society with the industrial capitalist" (Karl Marx, *The Poverty of Philosophy*, Moscow, p. 109). Technologically, the socialist and capitalist countries today are at roughtly one and the same level. Does this imply that the law of the correspondence of production relations to the character of the productive forces is no longer valid? The author's answer is "No". Examining the manifestations of this law today, he maintains that the current STR is potentially linked with socialism in terms of its substance and logic and can fully develop only when socialist and communist relations of production are established. He writes that there may arise productive forces of a new type meeting the requirements of planned management of the entire economy.

It is impossible, of course, to set out all the ideas of the book in this brief review. However, I wish to point out in conclusion the profound humanism of the book and the force with which the author, while giving the tremendous achievements of the contemporary STR due credit, stresses that science and technology are often compelled to serve destruction and not civilisation, war and not effort to improve the quality of life.

Barbu Zaharescu

[1] Valter Roman is also the author of *Science and Technology During the Transition of Society from Capitalism to Communism* (Bucharest, 1962), *The Industrial Revolution and Social Development* (Bucharest, 1965), and *The Scientific and Technological Revolution and Its Impact on Contemporary Social and Political Development* (Bucharest, 1968).

Facts, Figures, Information

Capitalist Economic Crises

THE year 1976 brought no relief to the capitalist economy from the upheavals of the 1974-1975 crisis. Realities have upset all the glowing forecasts made by Western economists at the beginning of the year that a period of recovery had set in.

A general decline in production was observed particularly in the latter half of the year, unemployment had reached proportions unprecedented in the past forty years and prices increased steeply.

In the November 8 issue of the *International Herald Tribune*, US, Japanese, Canadian,

Prepared by the USSR Academy of Sciences Institute of World Economy and International Relations.

FRG, British, French and Italian specialists call on their governments to "... immediately shift their policies ..." otherwise the "... world may face a new economic downturn. ..."

The impact and depth of the economic crisis that hit capitalism in 1974-75 is comparable only to that of the 1930s. It spread simultaneously to all the main capitalist economic centres. For the first time in the postwar period there was a noticeable backward movement of the economies of all the industrially developed capitalist countries. In 1975 their gross national product, as against 1973, dropped 1.7 per cent and industrial output of all the non-socialist countries shrank by 6 per cent, and 11.6 per cent in the industrially developed capitalist countries.

All branches of industry were affected by the slump, including new spheres of production (electronics, petro-chemical, automation, etc.). Oil extraction and the petroleum industry in the capitalist countries was thrown back to the 1972 level, the auto industry found itself at the 1970 level, and steel smelting, at the 1969 level.

Foreign trade relations in the capitalist world were badly affected by the crisis, causing sharp competition on the world market with a significant drop in international trade turnover. The physical volume of exports from the non-socialist countries in 1975 dropped by 5 per cent compared with 1974 and imports went down 13 per cent; correspondingly 7.2 and 11.6 per cent in the developed capitalist countries. The trade and balance of payments deficit reached huge proportions. In 1974 and 1975 they totalled 21.3 and 39.3 billion dollars respectively for the developed capitalist countries.

Unemployment reached immense proportions. According to the International Labour Organisation, the figure for 1975 was close to 18.5 million. This is double the 1973 level and almost 2.5 million more than official bourgeois statistics.

In contrast to previous economic upheavals, this crisis, besides the usual drop in industrial output, capital investments, growth of unemployment, etc., saw a further increase in inflation. From the middle of 1974 to the middle of 1975 export prices on raw materials on the world capitalist market increased 2.8 per cent; prices on fuel went up an average 10.4 per cent and prices on manufactured articles increased 32 per cent. Living costs sky-rocketed placing a still greater economic burden on the working people. From July 1974 to December 1975 prices on food and consumer goods in the developed capitalist countries went up an average 18.7 per cent, and a drop in the population's real incomes caused a sharp down trend in daily purchases.

Not only the economy has been affected by this crisis. It has been accompanied by a worsening of social conflicts, rapid development of the anti-imperialist movement, the peoples' growing struggle against imperialist oppression and economic inundation by foreign capital, particularly by the giant international monopolies. The character, depth and sharpness of the 1974-75 crisis stress the correctness of the conclusion drawn by the June 1976 Conference of European Communist and Workers' Parties: "The difficulties encountered by imperialism are the result of a further deepening of the general crisis of the capitalist system, affecting all spheres of capitalist society".

TABLE 1
1974-1975 Crisis

Sphere of economy and branch of industry	Unit of measurement	Year and quarter (month)		Indices		Duration of monthly declines	Extent of decline
		Pre-crisis high	Low point	Pre-crisis high	Low point		
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Developed capitalist countries as a whole							
Overall industrial production	1970=100	1974 2nd qr.	1975 2nd qr.	121	107	12	11.6
Extractive industries	1970=100	1974 2nd qr.	1975 2nd qr.	102	97	12	4.9
Manufacturing	1970=100	1974 2nd qr.	1975 2nd qr.	119	104	12	12.6
Energetics	1970=100	1974 4th qr.	1975 1st qr.	128	127	3	0.1
Metallurgy	1970=100	1974 1st qr.	1975 3rd qr.	127	93	18	26.8
Chemicals	1970=100	1974 3rd qr.	1975 2nd qr.	130	112	6	13.8
Totally unemployed	Thousands	1974 1st qr.	1975 4th qr.	8,605	16,050	21	+88.5
Consumer prices	1970=100	1974 2nd qr.	1975 4th qr.	139	165	18	+18.7
Exports physical volume	1974=100	1974	1975	100.0	95.7	12	4.3
Imports physical volume	1974=100	1974	1975	100.0	93.1	12	6.9
USA							
Gross national product	Billions of dollars; 1958 prices	1973 4th qr.	1975 1st qr.	845.7	780.0	15	7.8
Industrial output	1967=100	1974 Sept.	1975 March	131.8	111.7	6	15.3
Extractive industry	1967=100	1974 March	1975 Aug.	112.2	105.3	16	6.2
Electric power	1967=100	1973 Oct.	1974 Jan.	165.3	153.0	3	7.4
Steel output	Million tons	1973	1975	136.0	106.0	24	21.1
Output of:							
automobiles	Millions	1973	1975	9.7	6.7	24	30.9
trucks	Millions	1973	1975	2.9	2.2	24	24.1
Stock prices	1941-43=100	1973 Jan.	1974 Dec.	118.42	67.07	23	43.4
Bankruptcies	Units	1974	1975	9,915	11,300	12	+14.0
	Units	1973 Dec.	1975 April	693	1,202	16	+73.4
Unemployed	Thousands	1973 Oct.	1975 May	4,100	8,538	19	+108.2
Prices							
consumer	1967=100	1974	1975	147.7	161.2	12	+9.1
wholesale	1967=100	1974	1975	160.1	174.4	12	+9.0

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
JAPAN							
Gross national product	Billions of yen current prices	1974 3rd qr.	1975 1st qr.	89,990	89,038	8	1.1
Industrial output	1970=100	1973 Nov.	1975 Feb.	136.1	105.1	15	22.8
Extractive industries	1970=100	1973 Nov.	1975 Feb.	132.9	104.4	15	21.5
Manufacturing	1970=100	1973 Nov.	1975 Feb.	133.4	104.6	15	21.6
Electric power	Billion kwh	1973	1975	369.0	334.6	24	9.3
Coal	Million tons	1973	1975	22.4	19.3	24	13.9
Steel	Million tons	1973	1975	119.3	102.2	24	14.3
Automobile output	Thousands	1973	1975	7,042	6,942	24	1.4
Unemployed	Thousands	1973 Oct.	1975 Nov.	530	1,320	25	+149.1
Prices							
consumer	1970=100	1973 Nov.	1975 July	130.4	172.8	20	+32.5
wholesale	1970=100	1973 Nov.	1975 Sept.	125.6	157.3	22	+25.2
Stock prices	1968=100	1973 Jan.	1974 Oct.	401.9	265.5	21	35.7
Bankruptcies	Units	1973 Nov.	1974 Dec.	857	1,179	13	+37.5
FRG							
Gross national product	Billions marks 1962 prices	1974 1st qr.	1975 3rd qr.	149.5	142.0	18	5.3
Industrial output	1970=100	1974 Feb.	1975 July	114	100	17	12.3
Extractive industries	1970=100	1971 March	1975 Aug.	105	80	53	23.8
Manufacturing	1970=100	1974 Jan.	1975 July	114	98	18	14.0
Electric power	Billions kwh	1974	1975	306	297	12	2.9
Coal	Million tons	1974	1975	95.0	92.0	12	3.2
Steel	Million tons	1974	1975	53.0	41.0	12	22.6
Automobile output	Thousands	1973	1974	3,964	3,124	12	21.2
Unemployed	Thousands	1973 Jan.	1975 Dec.	228	1,345	35	+489.9
Prices							
consumer	1970=100	1974 Jan.	1975 Oct.	123.3	137.0	21	+11.1
wholesale	1960=100	1974 Jan.	1975 Aug.	121.0	136.0	19	+12.
Bankruptcies	Units	1973	1975	5,515	9,200	24	+66.
FRANCE							
Gross national product	1970=100	1974 3rd qr.	1975 1st qr.	124.0	117.0	6	5.
Industrial output	1970=100	1974 Aug.	1975 May	129	108	9	16.
Energetics	1970=100	1974 Aug.	1975 May	124	105	9	15.
Coal	Million tons	1974	1975	22.9	22.4	12	2.
Electric power	Billion kwh	1974	1975	180.2	178.4	12	1.
[illegible]	[illegible]	1974	1975	27.0	21.5	12	20.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Automobile output	Thousands	1974	1975	3,045	2,952	12	3.0
Average monthly unemployed	Thousands	1974	1975	497.7	860.9	12	+73.0
Prices							
consumer	1970=100	1974	1975	136.7	153.8	12	+14.0
wholesale (manufactured goods)	1962=100	1974 June	1975 June	208.5	186.8	12	10.4
Industrial stock prices	29 Dec. 1972=100	1973 May	1974 Sept.	120.3	64.8	16	46.1
Bankruptcies	Units	1974	1975	11,981	14,871	12	+24.1
GREAT BRITAIN							
Gross domestic product	Millions pound sterling, 1970 prices	1974 3rd qr.	1975 2nd qr.	12,234	11,785	9	3.7
Industrial production	1970=100	1973 Oct.	1975 Aug.	111.3	98.8	22	11.2
Extractive industries	1970=100	1974 July	1975 June	94	86	11	8.5
Manufacturing	1970=100	1973 Oct.	1975 Aug.	112.3	98.9	22	11.9
Electric power	Billion kwh	1974	1975	274.5	252.5	12	8.0
Coal	Million tons	1973	1974	132	111	12	15.9
Steel	Million tons	1974	1975	22.4	20.3	12	9.4
Automobile output	Thousands	1974	1975	1,936	1,430	12	26.1
Unemployed	Thousands	1973 Dec.	1975 Aug.	513.5	1,250.4	20	+143.5
Prices							
consumer	15 Jan. 1974=100	1974	1975	108.5	133.0	12	+22.6
wholesale (manufactured goods)	1970=100	1974	1975	152.0	188.0	12	+24.0
Stock prices	1970=100	1973	1974	130	76	12	41.5
Brankruptcies	Units	1974	1975	5,716	7,500	12	+31.2
ITALY							
Gross national product	Billion lira, current prices	1974 2nd qr.	1975 2nd qr.	97,182	92,809	12	4.5
Industrial production	1970=100	1974 April	1975 May	126.0	101.7	13	19.3
Extractive industry	1970=100	1974 Jan.	1975 June	114.0	85.7	17	24.8
Manufacturing	1970=100	1974 July	1974 Dec.	131.9	100.8	5	23.6
Electric power	Billion kwh	1974	1975	141.7	140.0	12	1.2
Steel	Million tons	1974	1975	23.8	22.4	12	5.9
Automobile output	Thousands	1974	1975	1,631.3	1,337.7	12	18.0
Unemployed	Thousands	1974 2nd qr.	1975 2nd qr.	484	667	12	+37.8
Prices							
consumer	1970=100	1974 1st qr.	1975 1st qr.	134.5	164.9	12	+22.6
wholesale	1970=100	1974 1st qr.	1975 1st qr.	160.6	190.2	12	+18.4
Bankruptcies	Units	1974	1975	3,883	3,806	12	1.9
Real wages	1966=100	1974	1975	156.2	166.4	12	+6.5

The 1974-75 crisis was preceded in the past 50 years by other crises of over-production that likewise affected, in greater or lesser degree, all spheres of the capitalist economic and social system.

The 1929-1933 crisis was devastating, lasting over an exceptionally long period. It affected all spheres of capitalist economic activity. Industrial output was cut almost by half, domestic and foreign trade was sharply reduced (export from all capitalist countries dropped by 67 per cent). The stock markets were in turmoil with a 60-75 per cent drop in share prices. Bankruptcies were widespread (109,000 in the United States from 1929 to 1932). But it was the working people who were affected the worst. Real wages dropped sharply and every fourth worker and employee was left without a job.

After several years of the depression and a slight pickup, the latter half of 1937 was hit by a new general crisis. Preparations for the Second World War, however, had their effect on this crisis. The outbreak of war interrupted the cycle.

The United States was the centre of the first postwar crisis in 1948-49. Industrial output experienced an 18 per cent drop, bankruptcies increased and more than 4 million were left jobless. Britain and Canada were not affected to the same extent. West European countries and Japan were still rebuilding their war-ravaged economies and this helped keep the manufacturing industry alive.

The 1957-58 crisis affected a much larger number of capitalist countries with a noticeable convergence of the phases of their economic cycles. Production dropped in the manufacturing industry in the United States, Canada, Britain, Italy, Japan and France. Although there was no general production slump in the FRG, its rate of growth was reduced to a minimum and many of the larger branches of industry found themselves in a crisis (extractive, metallurgical, ship-building and textile). The crisis was accompanied by a big increase of unemployment with about 10 million unemployed in the capitalist world.

The 1970-71 overproduction crisis by comparison was not very deep. It differed from the others because this was the first crisis in postwar years to affect all the developed capitalist countries and create the prerequisites for synchronising the economic cycle. The impossibility of settling the crisis caused a further intensive accumulation of the "products of the disintegration" of the capitalist system.

TABLE 2
1929-1971 Crises
(Developed Capitalist Countries as a Whole 1929-1933 Crisis)

Sphere of economy and branch of industry	Unit of measurement	Year and quarter (month)		Indices		Duration of monthly declines	Extent of decline
		Pre-crisis high	Low point	Pre-crisis high	Low point		
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
		1929-1933 Crisis					
General index of industrial production	1929=100	1929 June	1932 July	103.6	58.0	37	46.0
Coal	Million tons	1929	1932	1,169	806	36	31.1
Oil	Million tons	1929	1932	186	152	36	18.3
Electric power	Billions kwh	1930	1932	302	254	24	15.9
Steel	Million tons	1929	1932	110	42	36	61.8
Automobile output	Thousands	1929	1932	6,276	1,950	36	69.0
Unemployed	Thousands	1929	1932	5,852	25,988	36	+344.1
Real incomes	1929=100	1929	1932	100.0	42.3	36	57.7

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
		1937-1938 Crisis					
General index of industrial production	1937=100	1937 June	1938 March	102	91	9	10.8
Electric power	Billion kwh	1937	1938	382	389	12	+1.8
Coal	Million tons	1937	1938	1,068	973	12	8.9
Oil	Million tons	1937	1938	243	235	12	3.3
Steel	Million tons	1937	1938	113	87	12	23.0
Automobile output	Thousands	1937	1938	6,269	3,770	12	39.9
		1948-1949 Crisis					
General index of industrial production	1937=100	1948 July	1949 April	133	125	9	6.0
Coal	Million tons	1948	1949	1,140	1,021	12	10.4
Oil	Million tons	1948	1949	434	427	12	1.6
Steel	Million tons	1948	1949	130.2	129.6	12	0.5
		1957-1958 Crisis					
General index of industrial production	1958=100	1957 4th qr.	1958 3rd qr.	103	98	9	5.0
Coal	Million tons	1957	1958	1,139	1,060	12	6.9
Steel	Million tons	1957	1958	218	187	12	14.2
Automobile output	Millions	1957	1958	11.6	10.5	12	9.5
Unemployed	Thousand	1957	1958	7,300	9,560	12	+31.0
		1970-1971 Crisis					
General index of industrial production	1963=100	1970 March	1970 Nov.	152	148	8	2.7
Coal	Million tons	1970	1972	1,146	1,092	24	4.7
Iron ore	Million tons	1971	1972	500	480	12	4.0
Steel	Million tons	1970	1971	416	395	12	5.0
Automobile output	Millions	1969	1970	27.8	26.4	12	5.0

Not all these crises were identical in their impact and the number of countries they affected and each reflected specific historical conditions. Nevertheless, each represented a new stage in the growth of the main capitalist contradictions that are weakening its foundations. Crises are a sign of the mounting difficulties in managing the productive forces, caused by the capitalist system, of the increasing contradictions between the growing social character of production and the private capitalist form of appropriation.

The GDR National Front

At the request of our readers, WMR *is starting publication of data on the national fronts in socialist countries. The work of these associations of political parties and public organisations operating under the guidance of Communist and Workers' parties is a sign of the progress of socialist democracy and that all democratic forces grow ever more united around the working class and its Party.*

THE GDR National Front, founded when the first state of workers and peasants was proclaimed on German soil, is closely linked with the development of our socialist country. The National Front has become a form of organised union of all forces in our

socialist society. "In the National Front of the German Democratic Republic," says the Constitution of the GDR, "parties and mass organisations unite all the forces of the people for joint action in advancing socialist society."

The following factors contributed to the creation of the National Front: co-operation between anti-fascists and democrats, grown strong in the anti-fascist struggle; the historic victory of the Soviet Union and its allies over Hitler fascism and liberation of the German people from nazi tyranny, making possible greater joint action by all progressive forces; an acute awareness by the overwhelming majority of citizens of the need for a concerted effort to remove the aftermaths of the war and build the new society. Guided by the working class and its revolutionary party, a broad anti-fascist democratic movement emerged soon after the war forming the base of the National Front whose main goals are preserving peace, opposing the imperialist policy of aggression and war, developing friendship with the Soviet Union and the other countries of the socialist community, ensuring that the people acquire a deep understanding of the ideas of socialist patriotism and proletarian internationalism, involving the population of the republic in building a developed socialist society, mobilising the people in fulfilling decisions of government bodies, and raising the people's ideological, political and cultural levels.

The National Front includes representatives of all political and mass organisations in the GDR and unaffiliated citizens. Five friendly parties and several public organisations form the Democratic Bloc, the nucleus of the National Front. These are the *Socialist Unity Party of Germany (SUPG)*, which plays a leading role in the Front and in all the country's government and public affairs. Tody, the SUPG's central role is increasing. Armed with a scientific knowledge of the laws governing historical developments, the Party is elaborating a well grounded and feasible programme for society's development. The programme is being realised together with all the country's political forces.

The other parties are the *Democratic Peasants' Party of Germany (DPPG), Liberal-Democratic Party of Germany (LDPG), Christian-Democratic Union (CDU)* and the *National-Democratic Party of Germany (NDPG)*.

The public organisations include the Confederation of Free German Trade Unions (CFGTU), Democratic Women's League of Germany (DWLG), Free German Youth (FGY) and others. Through these organisations millions of citizens participate in building socialism, managing the state and the economy.

The GDR's political parties and mass organisations give their full support to the genera line of the Ninth SUPG Congress for the new stage in the development of our socialis society, stressing their unbreakable ties with the working class party.

The National Front structure is based on the territorial principle. Its executive body i the National Council whose almost 300 members represent all sections of the population It is elected by the National Front Congress. The Council presidium has fifty or mor members. The Council chairman has five deputies who represent each party.

With the Democratic Bloc the National Front nominates candidates to variou government bodies including the People's Chamber, the supreme body of power. After th elections the National Council maintains constant ties with the representative bodies an deputies. At National Front meetings the deputies report to the constituents, discus problems, respond to suggestions, requests and questions.

The National Front committees deal with many problems. Three hundred thousan elected members representing all organisations work at the 15 district, 243 regional, 57 city and 16,000 rural committees and residential neighbourhood committees. Of the more than 120,000 are unaffiliated, and about a third are women.

The local elective government bodies, their councils, deputies and commissions work i close contact with National Front committees. On a committee level the populatic discusses drafts of important decisions before they are discussed by the electi government bodies. The constructive proposals on national and local problems made he are forwarded to the elective bodies.

As the GDR has developed, the National Front, under the tried and tested guidance

the working class party, has become the people's socialist movement and was instrumental in launching a broad public initiative to realise priority economic plans, deal with local problems in improving living and working conditions and make maximum use of material and monetary funds and of untapped resources.

Much has been accomplished in recent years in the traditional rural and urban improvement competitions. Every year approximately four million citizens donate part of their free time for this. Such socialist competition programmes cover a one-year period. As a result of voluntary work, from 1971 to 1975 over five billion marks have been economised in housing maintenance and a good deal has been accomplished in other areas as well. Citizens help to erect, repair or renovate schools, clinics and other public buildings. They lay out recreation centres, sports grounds, parks, playgrounds, plant trees and shrubs *etc.* This not only economises on funds, it also has civic-educattion aspects.

The National Front helps the formation of an active cultural life. More than three thousand amateur art festivals are held yearly at enterprises.

The GDR National Front co-operates with 37 similar public movements in Europe, Asia, Africa and Latin America. Close contacts with national fronts in the socialist countries are at the centre of the National Front's international activities. We are particularly interested in joint ideological-political work, exchanging views, especially on developing the socialist consciousness of our citizens.

The Ninth SUPG Congress launched a new stage in our development. On the basis of Congress decisions, the primary task of the National Front is to raise civic responsibility, assert socialist morals and way of life. The parties and public organisations united in the National Front, wholeheartedly support the SUPG's general line. Closely united, we are building a developed socialist society, thereby creating the basic prerequisites for a gradual transition to communism.

Erich Correns
Chairman, National Council,
GDR National Front

From Official Sources

US Arms Deliveries

THE London *Financial Times*, on the basis of official statistics, writes: "... the United States is in the position of selling more arms abroad than all other Western nations combined." In the past five years the volume of arms devlieries has increased 14-fold, to $13 billion.

Sales are conducted mainly through the Pentagon. In 1975, private military sales accounted for an additional $600 billion.

The bulk of US arms deliveries are to the Middle East. The United States is also provoking an arms race in Asian and African countries. In 1976 Asian countries received $1.4 billion in arms deliveries as against $677 million last year, and arms deliveries to African countries have almost quadrupled.

Countries Placing Largest Orders for US Arms Deliveries
(1976 in millions of dollars)

Country	Amount
Saudi Arabia	2,502.5
Iran	1,301.3
Israel	919.5
South Korea	625.9
Switzerland	454.7
Jordan	436.1
Australia	411.9
FRG	194.2
Taiwan	193.0
Kuwait	130.6
Morocco	120.8
Thailand	89.6
Greece	83.0
Spain	79.4
Egypt	67.3
Canada	65.8
Great Britain	46.5
Pakistan	38.6

Large contingents of US personnel are stationed in the purchasing countries and their number is constantly growing. If the present trend continues, in Iran, for example, there will be as many as 60 thousand by 1980.

The sale of arms abroad is the cornerstone of the operations of the arms manufacturing monopolies and "... directly affects the fortunes of McDonnell Douglas, Grumman Lockheed, Northrop and other major suppliers" wrote *Newsweek* (September 6). Arms exports are also encouraged by other monopolies seeking lucrative markets for their products.

Profits of Arms Exports
(1975, millions dollars)

Company	Profits
McDonnell Douglas	419
Grumman	298
Northrop	293
Textron	249
General Electric	209
United Technologies	19
Raytheon	17
Lockheed	17
Hughes Aircraft	15
Boeing	12

Diary

AT the invitation of the Portuguese Communist Party, its Eighth Congress was attended by a delegation from this journal. The General Secretary of the PCP, Alvaro Cunhal, met with the journal's Editor-in-Chief, Konstantin Zarodov, to whom he described the main political tasks confronting the Party and noted the journal's important role in the Portuguese Communists' ideological and propaganda activities.

Ismail Belin, General Secretary, CC CP Turkey, visited the editorial offices, and in a talk with staff members gave a detailed account of the situation in his country and the difficult struggle of its Communists. Closer co-operation with the journal was also discussed.

Deputy General Secretary of the Afro-Asian Solidarity Organisation, Nouri Abdel Razzak Hussein, visited the journal and discussed co-operation with his organisation. He expressed his high appreciation of the journal and its contribution to the movement of the progressive peace forces for solidarity with the fighters for national and social emancipation in Asia and Africa.

As in previous years, Peace and Socialism Publishers were represented at the 28th book fair in Frankfurt-am-Main (FRG). Its stand was visited by a delegation from the Executive of the German Communist Party led by the Party's Chairman, Herbert Mies.

The *WMR* editorial offices were visited by Ibrahim Abdel Halim, Chief Editor of *Socialist Researches*, a magazine published in the Arab Republic of Egypt. There was an exchange of views on fostering closer contacts between the Egyptian journal and *WMR*.

International Photo Competition

"For Peace, Detente and Social Progress"

Problems of Peace and Socialism (World Marxist Review) and the International Organisation of Journalists (IOJ) are conducting an international photographic competition in 1977. Its motto is: For Peace, Detente and Social Progress.

The competition is open to progressive and democratic photojournalists and amateurs of all countries inspired by the ideals of the struggle for peace, detente and social progress. The photographs should reflect different aspects of the struggle—its mass character, heroism and humanism.

There will be three main prizes of 6,000, 4,000 and 2,000 Czechoslovak crowns, and winners may choose either goods or cash in Czechoslovak currency. There will also be a number of consolation prizes and diplomas.

The competition will be adjudicated by a jury of representatives of *Problems of Peace and Socialism*, the International Organisation of Journalists and well-known photojournalists.

The best photos will be published in *Problems of Peace and Socialism* and the *Democratic Journalist* in 1977.

Black and white photos, 18 x 24 cm, should have appropriate captions and be marked "Photo competition". Please mention your name, country, the place the picture was taken and at what date. The photos are to be sent to *Problems of Peace and Socialism*, Thakurova 3, Prague 6, Czechoslovakia, not later than October 10, 1977.

Jury of the "For Peace, Detente and
Social Progress" Photo Competition

English edition of

PROBLEMS OF PEACE AND SOCIALISM

Theoretical and Information journal of Communist and Workers' Parties throughout the world

PUBLISHED IN PRAGUE WORKERS OF ALL LANDS UNITE

VOLUME 20 FEBRUARY 1[illegible] NO. 2

CONTENTS

PROBLEMS OF PEACE AND SOCIALISM

is also published in Arabic, Bengali, Bulgarian, Czech, Danish, Finnish, French, German Greek, Hebrew, Hindi, Hungarian, Italian, Japanese, Malayalam, Mongolian, Norwegian Persian, Polish, Portuguese, Punjabi, Romanian, Russian, Singhalese, Spanish, Swedish Tamilnad, Turkish and Vietnamese.

Enquiries for subscriptions to any of these editions should be sent to Press Circulation Agency, Thakurova 3, 16616 Prague 6, Czechoslovakia.

Published by S. C. Easton, 16 King Street, London, W.C.2., and printed by Farleigh Press (T.U.) Ltd., Watford

Corvalan's Message to our Journal in the First Days After Release

WARM fraternal greetings to *World Marxist Review*, which is making a big contribution to solidarity of the peoples fighting imperialism and its fascist stooges.

I am grateful to the journal for its part in the campaign for my release, for the release of all Chilean political prisoners, and in the struggle for the overthrow of the dictatorship, for democracy, progress and social justice in my country.

Luis Corvalan

December 28, 1976

THE Editorial Board, Editorial Council and readers of *WMR* express warm gratitude to Luis Corvalan for his message of greetings. We regard the release of the General Secretary of the Communist Party of Chile from fascist prison as the result of the staunchness and courage of this Communist, patriot and fighter for the freedom and happiness of the people of Chile, as a victory for the Chilean people and the powerful world-wide solidarity movement.

World Marxist Review will not relax its solidarity with the Chilean patriots unlawfully kept in prison by the fascist junta, with all prisoners of reactionary régimes, and with all fighters for peace, democracy, social progress and socialism.

Key Trends of the Liberation Process

AZIZ MOHAMMED
First Secretary, CC Iraqi Communist Party

EVER since the first liberation revolutions in Asia heralded the imminent collapse of colonialism, people on all continents have been witnessing an unprecedented upsurge in the struggle of the Afro-Asian peoples, who have entered the era of national renaissance. The revolutionary process in the area of national liberation struggles is developing at a fast and vigorous pace. The masses, who have risen to the stature of makers of history, demand radical changes and the complete release of their countries from the remnants of colonial bondage, neocolonialist tutelage and dependence.

In pondering on the evolution of the national liberation movement, we may well ask: What are the overall results of its progress in the past years? What criteria and standards should be used for making an objective, realistic assessment of them? It is particularly important to answer this question now because, perhaps more markedly then since World War II a differentiation is taking place throughout the liberation movement, and the class struggle in the developing countries themselves is gaining momentum. At the same time imperialism, allying itself with domestic reactionaries and rightists, is trying to intensify its activity in key areas of Africa and Asia. There is every reason to say that in step with changes undermining the very pillars of the system of oppression and exploitation, international as well as national conditions for the liberation struggle are becoming more complicated (this is only too evident in certain regions) and revolutionary action meets

with growing enemy resistance. To ignore these phenomena is to show self-assurance and superficiality in estimating realities. Yet dialectical approach requires that we take account of the main factor—the decisive trends of the liberation process—and analyse it at both the regional and the global level. Moreover, these trends should be regarded as a concrete manifestation of more general laws and should be closely linked with dominant international trends.

Decisive Results

In describing the revolutionary national-liberation struggle in Asia and Africa, I would like, first of all, to stress its continuous progress, the tremendous expansion of its scope in recent years, the emergence of new effective forms, and the increased participation of the masses in the battle for the ideals of independence, peace and social progress. These positive aspects have materialised in the Afro-Asian peoples' gains, which are also a fruit of the solidarity and joint effort of all revolutionary contingents of today.

The victories achieved by the peoples of Indochina over US imperialism and the reunification of Vietnam, proclaimed a socialist republic, were a great accomplishment of the world revolutionary and national liberation movement. Today the Socialist Republic of Vietnam, which has over 50 million inhabitants, is the world's third biggest socialist country in terms of population. It has vast experience of participation in anti-imperialist liberation struggles, enjoys high revolutionary prestige and is an important factor for peace and progress in its region and throughout Asia.

The family of socialist nations is now being joined by the Laotian People's Democratic Republic, a state led by the Marxist-Leninist People's Revolutionary Party. Democratic Kampuchea has embarked on independent development.

The immense significance of these events stands out in the light of the fact that more than two decades ago imperialism succeeded in partitioning Vietnam (as well as Korea), something the world revolutionary forces were not strong enough to prevent. The situation is different now. Due to the new balance of world class forces, the policy of armed intervention was completely defeated in Indochina and a new, important bridgehead was won in the struggle for national and social liberation.

Another historic achievement of the liberation movement was the rise of a group of progressive states in Asia and Africa. An outstanding event in the mid-seventies was the victory in Angola, which gave a powerful spur to the Africans' struggle against imperialism, colonialism and racism. In this case, too, the outcome of the struggle was largely predetermined by the world balance of class forces and, above all, by the effective aid which the socialist community, primarily the Soviet Union and Cuba, extended to the Angolans at the crucial moment.

The victory in Angola was also made possible by the situation in Africa itself, where the growing family of revolutionary democratic states firmly holds the historical initiative. It is these states that launched a powerful campaign in support of the newly-established Angolan Republic. They exposed the clique of FNLA and UNITA traitors in the eyes of the whole continent and emphatically demanded an end to the South African racists' intervention against Angola. And if imperialism today is unable to impose its "solution" of the problem of Rhodesia and Namibia, this, too, is due primarily to the vigilance of progressive African states rejecting the neocolonialist formulas of US and British diplomacy and the racist Vorster régime.

The struggle for economic independence has made new gains. In many Asian and African countries, the established policy now is aimed at nationalising foreign property, setting up a state sector and effecting an agrarian reform and other progressive changes. The developing countries are engaged in an unprecedented

battle for international economic relations based on equal rights. They have gone over from isolated to collective action to bring about a revision of the *entire* system of their economic links with developed capitalist countries. They are not content to wrest partial concessions from imperialism, such as price increases for this or that raw material. This finds reflection in a corresponding anti-imperialist policy.

The events brought on by the fourth Arab-Israeli war in the Middle East revealed the close connection between the economic and political aspects of the liberation struggles. With the energy crisis in the capitalist world worsening, Arab countries used oil as a weapon of both economic and political struggle against imperialism and the Israeli aggressor.

Among the achievements of the peoples of developing countries is the choice by all the non-alignment movement of such basic orientations as anti-imperialism and adherence to the principles of economic equality. It is very important that today this movement gives evidence of its keen sense of responsibility for the destiny of world peace, declares for detente and its extension to other continents, and supports the peace initiative of the socialist countries, or, in other words, keeps pace with the times.

In spite of attempts to divert the non-aligned countries from these fundamental aspirations and set them against the socialist community, the dominant trend of the movement is progressive. This was also evident at its latest conference in Colombo, which strongly condemned the policy of racism and apartheid, various aspects of neocolonialist policy and the aggressive tendencies of imperialism. The countries participating in the movement also demonstrated their resolve to act together in defending their economic and political sovereignty and promote international co-operation with a view to establishing economic relations on an equitable basis.

Positive changes are steadily gaining ground in the huge expanses of Africa and Asia. Even in our region, in spite of the imperialist and Zionist policy of aggression, the seizure of Arab lands by Israel, the tragedy of the Arab people of Palestine and the dramatic events in Lebanon, there is no ignoring such real gains of the liberation movement as the consolidation of progressive régimes in a number of Arab countries, a noticeable weakening of the positions of imperialist monopolies, first of all the oil companies, the formation of progressive national fronts and the extension of the basis of resistance to imperialism and Zionist aggression. Furthermore, a number of revolutionary democratic parties, such as the United Political Organisation—National Front of the People's Democratic Republic of Yemen—have declared scientific socialism to be their ideology. These are our real successes.

We may therefore put it on record that the above-mentioned gains of the peoples of these continents represent a higher quality than the sum total of the gains of recent years. For behind each of these gains are common and deep-going trends that determine their inevitability.

The Hard Path of Change

Public life in Asian and African countries today shows two basic trends. One of them is the increasingly strong social orientation of the national struggle and the other the extension of its content as an anti-imperialist liberation struggle.

The social content of liberation struggles finds its most precise expression with the winning of national freedom. It is generally represented by political forces speaking for classes and social strata which see in socialism and the socialist orientation the only correct road to genuine independence and a new society that will end exploitation. First among these forces are the working class and its numerous allies among the exploited population groups.

In the early years after World War II, the struggle of Asian and African peoples for progressive social ideals and genuine liberation assumed vast proportions and was particularly effective in countries where Communists were at the head of a mass liberation movement—witness the historic victories of the Vietnamese (August 1945), Korean and Chinese revolutions. With due regard to the situation in their countries, the Communists led them along the road of people's democracy, which was a special form of transition to socialism and whose substance was the dictatorship of the proletariat.

Subsequently, too, as the national liberation area continued to widen, increasing segments of society in one-time colonies saw that the mere act of declaring independence was not enough for independence to become a reality. This was confirmed by the early liberation revolutions in the Middle East—the Egyptian (1952) and the Iraqi (1958)—which showed that revolutionary democracy, a new major force of social renewal capable of expressing the progressive aims of social development, was entering the political scene in Asia and Africa. In later decades, the revolutionary processes led by this force assumed so vast a scale that development on these continents today is unthinkable without the revolutionary democrats.

Another key and characteristic trend of the liberation movement is its anti-imperialist orientation. It arose in the colonial period, of course, and at first took on chiefly an anti-colonial form; that is, rejected imperialist political domination. After the colonial system had fallen apart this trend acquired new features due, first of all, to the emergence of dozens of new sovereign nations which enormously extended the geographical framework and scope of the anti-imperialist struggle. As contradictions between developing and developed capitalist countries continue to grow, more and more countries are objectively drawn into the anti-imperialist orbit. Secondly, the struggle is gradually spreading from the political to other spheres.

The increasing operation of the anti-imperialist trend is due to such an objective process as the steady shrinking of the social and economic basis of imperialist domination in Asian and African countries. Hence, the marked weakening of the positions of the feudal classes and groups of the bourgeoisie, of compradors, traditionally linked with imperialism. The weakening of imperialist positions expressed itself, among other things, in several waves of nationalisation in the Arab East and in other progressive measures adopted by national governments. Besides, the basis for anti-imperialist action is expanding and the anti-imperialist movement as a whole is going from strength to strength as large sections of the petty bourgeoisie and democratic elements of the national bourgeoisie join in the liberation process. Even those who until recently did not as much as dream of taking "liberties" with imperialism are now compelled to reckon with this movement.

Experience has confirmed that the anti-imperialist trend is a progressive trend covering a long period. But in making this generally correct statement, we cannot forget that its actual evolution by no means follows a straight line. What is correct from the continental, and still more from the global, point of view needs to be amended when we analyse the situation in specific countries and regions. Nor must we forget that the deeper the content of the anti-imperialist trend, the stronger the resistance it meets. The situation in our region is most indicative in this respect. The struggle between the forces of progress and all patriots, on the one hand, and the forces of reaction and various opportunists, on the other, has intensified here to an unprecedented degree. The Middle East policy of imperialism, whose aim is to turn back the wheel of change, is particularly treacherous. The gains of the Arab liberation movement are in serious danger, as the situation created by the events in Lebanon shows.

There are, we believe, at least four reasons for the sharp contradictions

endangering the Arab national liberation movement.

First, Israel's occupation of Arab lands is continuing and the problem of the Arab people of Palestine is as acute as ever.

Second, a number of countries still have unsolved problems of social liberation, as the continuing domination of monarchic states by feudal elements indicates.

Third, differentiation in the liberation movement of the Arab East takes on particularly sharp forms under a social structure that is, on the whole, more developed than in other regions of Asia and Africa. The experience of Egypt has shown that in spite of the anti-bourgeois reforms effected in President Nasser's day, capitalism, which had taken deep root in that country, retained considerable influence, with the result that new bourgeois elements emerged in town and countryside, specifically in the administrative apparatus.

Fourth, the struggle between the forces of progress and reaction in the Middle East is also aggravated by the fact that it is probably the first region in Asia and Africa where progressive changes directed by revolutionary democrats have gone beyond the bounds of national liberation objectives and acquired an anti-capitalist content.

It is most important to take the latter circumstance into account when analysing imperialist strategy in our region. The purpose of this strategy is to recapture the initiative and positions lost several years ago. In this connection, I wish to quote the terse and very exact definition of recent events in Lebanon given by Leonid Brezhnev, General Secretary of the CC CPSU: "Looking deep into those events," he said, "we see that they are a new attempt by world imperialism, that is, the United States and other NATO powers, to deal a blow at the forces of anti-imperialist revolution in the Middle East, to preserve and strengthen its positions there. Imperialism has now taken the road of provoking internecine strife among Arabs. This is made possible by the increased class stratification in Arab countries and by growing social and political differences between them."[1]

It follows that the anti-imperialist trend in the Arab East today meets considerable obstacles. Nor is this due to only the expansionist policy of the US ruling circles. There is no overlooking the changes in the social basis that have occurred in the region in recent years. In the past, imperialist influence was promoted mainly by Arab reaction. Nowadays, however, this role is also claimed by right-wing currents in the liberation movement that express the interests of new groups of the rural and urban bourgeoisie and pro-bourgeois elements in the state apparatus. Attempts are made to co-ordinate the activities of reactionaries and rightists and to expand their collaboration in various fields. More often than not, Saudi Arabia plays the role of initiator and mediator in carrying out these measures.

To be sure, the Saudi régime today is compelled, as Arab affairs reveal, to take account both of the will of multinational monopolies and the demands of the liberation forces opposing them, at least to some extent. But what we have here is not genuine anti-imperialism; it is a selfish policy, an effort to exploit contradictions between developed capitalist and oil-producing countries. Nor is it accidental that Saudi Arabia's rulers and their allies in the region, who are just as reactionary, preserve their fundamental relations with imperialist countries, first of all with the United States, and do their best to further them, with due regard to the demands and requirements of their imperialist partners.

What is going on in our region and in the Arab liberation movement also has a broader meaning. Operating here is a general law which consists in *intensification* of the differentiation process, primarily in those sectors of the liberation struggle where social changes have gone deepest. Besides, the imperialists believe that if they manage to channel events in the Middle East as they wish they will have a greater chance of succeeding in other areas of Asia and Africa. Indeed

the United States, profiting by certain results of its diplomacy, first of all by the Sinai agreement, tried to test "shuttle tactics" in Africa. But it came up against powerful resistance by freedom-loving African countries whose joint action in recent years has foiled many a reactionary plan, many an imperialist act of subversion.

The Role of Class Alliances

We know from history that even the most progressive trends do not become a real force until they are backed in adequate measure, not only in the region or continent concerned, but all over the world. This support for the national liberation movement has been coming from the socialist world system and the international working class.

Iraq's Communists have always attached special importance to close contacts between the Arab liberation movement an the socialist world, primarily the great Soviet Union. Their position has already won widespread recognition in our country. The ruling Arab Socialist Baath Party is oriented towards a strategic alliance with the Soviet Union. What enabled Iraq to carry the anti-imperialist revolution deeper and take the non-capitalist road was effective aid from countries of the socialist community.

Iraq's relations with these countries are expressive of the rise of a new type of international relations prompted by the need of close co-operation among the peoples interested in preserving and furthering their social and economic gains. In other words, it is a case of shaping international relations based on general democratic principles and, moreover, giving them a progressive social content. This type of relations is spreading as relations between the Soviet Union and Angola, Mozambique and other progressive African countries have vividly exemplified in the recent period. At the same time, the political content of relations between the socialist community and the newly-free countries is being continuously enriched, which expresses itself in their closer co-operation in the struggle against imperialism, for national and social liberation, for world peace and security.

Support from the working class and the democratic movement in developed capitalist countries is of tremendous importance for the destiny of the liberation struggle. Its value is seen in the record of numerous campaigns of solidarity with the peoples of Indochina, which were also an effective method of influencing imperialist governments. We also know that advanced workers and all democrats in the capitalist world have done a good deal for the Arab peoples by exposing Israel's policy of conquest and the policy of its patrons in the USA. However, greater efforts are needed now to defeat the Tel Aviv-Washington conspiracy and to expose Zionist ideology and practice unrelentingly and from positions of principle. Such solidarity would contribute immensely to our fight for a fair settlement in the Middle East and for the consolidation of progressive régimes there.

The problems of class alliances and of the unity of patriotic forces also have intra-regional and continental aspects. Speaking of our region, it is unfortunately a fact that differences between progressive régimes have not yet been removed, which generally weakens the front of revolutionary Arab forces. These forces, which bear the main responsibility for progress in the Arab world, must try harder than ever to find the most suitable formula for united action. It is essential, first of all, to overcome differences of secondary importance that can be settled in a spirit of mutual understanding and with due regard to common objectives and tasks.

We think the important thing at present is for the progressive and genuinely patriotic forces of the Arab world to realise the undeniable fact that what draws them together is much greater than what divides them. The objective basis for their unity is the struggle for the liberation of all occupied Arab lands, for the

right of the Arab people of Palestine to self-determination and independent national statehood, and awareness of the need to resist Israeli aggression and defend progressive Arab régimes in order to assure their further development. If united, the revolutionary forces of Arab countries could use such recognised forums as the Arab League more effectively to achieve democratic liberation goals.

As regards the broader aspect of the effort to consolidate the forces of progress, democracy and national independence in our two continents, we are convinced that growing co-operation among revolutionary democratic régimes could become one of its main lines. It is important to steadfastly promote the movement of Afro-Asian solidarity and support all the positive gains made by the non-aligned movement and the new forms of collective resistance to imperialism, especially in the economic field, that are developing today.

New International Climate

The processes and trends I have described are developing in close interaction with the world situation, as the record of the national liberation revolutions of recent decades attests.

Their powerful wave swept across Asia at a time when the triumph of the anti-fascist forces which defeated Hitler Germany and Japanese militarism enabled mankind to take a resolute step towards peace. That was when several liberation revolutions were accomplished and the democratic movement surged high in many colonies and semi-colonies. This upsurge coincided with a general uptrend in the world-wide revolutionary struggle and its main result was the rise of the socialist world system. At that time imperialism, seeing a global threat to its positions, imposed the cold war on the peoples by emphasising the policy of confrontation with the Soviet Union and other socialist countries. It also used the cold war as a means of "rolling back" the national liberation movement. These aims were promoted by a system of military blocs, the strategy of extending military and economic "aid" and other measures.

The policy of building up tensions and fomenting anti-Communist hysteria could not check the revolutionary process but could slow down the pace of change. Let us recall such a phenomenon of cold war memory as the notorious Eisenhower doctrine, which claimed for the United States the right to intervene militarily in countries of our region on the pretext of "defending them against international communism". That doctrine was the ideological rationale of the American-British intervention in Lebanon and Jordan after the 1958 revolution in Iraq. Although the invaders were unable to achieve all their objectives, they headed off for a time a trend towards deepening the revolutionary liberation process in those countries that did not suit them. Today the USA, striving to obstruct a fair settlement of the Middle East conflict and taking advantage of tensions in the region, plans to undermine with the backing of domestic reaction the progressive régimes existing there. After the victories in Indochina, Thailand's new military régime is trying, not without the prompting and support of certain US quarters to revive the cold war atmosphere, which it sees as a reliable means of holding up the revolution. In short, imperialism defends itself everywhere and always through a policy of stepped-up tensions, war hysteria and confrontation.

This is why the historic turn towards detente was hailed so enthusiastically in Asia and Africa. It also explains the widespread support given on these continent to the numerous peace initiatives of socialist countries. The benefits of detente ar already enjoyed by the peoples, both in Europe and elsewhere. The genera relaxation of world tensions has had an essentially beneficial effect on the situatio in Southeast and South Asia and some other areas. To our deep regret, the Middl East is not among them as yet. The situation there is extremely uncertain and new armed conflict may break out at any moment.

Yet while bearing in mind the situation in our region, which is so far removed from the concept of detente, we visualise the gigantic advance that events in the Middle East would score if they moved in this direction of fundamental international importance. The key to extending detente to the Middle East is, now as in the past, a comprehensive settlement implying the withdrawal of Israeli troops from all the Arab territories overrun in 1967 and the exercise by the Arab people of Palestine of their legitimate rights, including the right to self-determination and the establishment of a national state. Such a settlement, for which the Geneva Conference is an adequate forum, would mean not only vindicating the fundamental general democratic principles of international relations in our region, but taking a new step towards developing the liberation movement of Arab peoples, strengthening the positions of progressive régimes and, lastly, bringing about the victory of the just cause of the long-suffering Arab people of Palestine. A turn towards detente in the Middle East on this basis would undoubtedly strengthen the anti-imperialist trend in the Arab liberation movement and afford its vanguard contingents new opportunities.

In analysing historic developments altering the world, the Communists are far from looking at this process through rose-coloured spectacles. Genuine revolutionaries are always realistic thinkers. They never exaggerate what has been achieved and never give in to complacency, for they know that the road of the revolution is never smooth. But even going through the hardest trials, the Communists never lose sight of the main guidelines suggested by the epoch or its key trends. They always discern in the maze of events what is particularly important, and know how to turn temporary retreats into a counter-offensive. This is a source of strength and indestructible optimism to them.

---

[1] *Pravda*, October 26, 1976.

Specific Features of Socialist Democracy in Cuba

BLAS ROCA
Political Bureau and Secretariat member, CC Communist Party of Cuba

POPULAR rule in Cuba has now been given its definitive structure. Why, we are sometimes asked, did we not do this immediately after the revolution. The answer was given by Fidel Castro at the First Congress of the Communist Party: "The revolution," he said, "was in no hurry to finalise the political structure. For it was not a matter of formalities, but of creating well thought-out and permanent institutions corresponding to Cuban reality."

In the first ten years the principal task of revolutionary power was to withstand and repel aggression by imperialism and its agents. It took many different forms—sabotage, assassination attempts, subversion, espionage, the landing of mercenaries, support and arms for the bandit gangs operating in various parts of the country. We had to muster all the revolutionary forces of the people to crush these enemy sallies and, at the same time, extend the work of socialist transformation, develop the economy, build up the education and public health systems and meet many other requirements of the people.

This process strengthened the unity of all the revolutionary forces on the basi of Marxism-Leninism and firmly established the socialist character of the revolu

tion. We defeated the North American imperialists aggressors and, guided by the interests of the masses, our national-liberation and socialist aims carried out fundamental social and economic reforms which consolidated the unity of our people and strengthened its determination to defend the gains of the revolution and forge ahead to build a socialist society.

There were no elections to government bodies. But there were regular, democratic elections in the trade unions, peasant, student, women and other organisations which, alongside the Committees for the Defence of the Revolution (CDR) played, and continue to play, a major role in the country's life. Besides, our government leaders and the heads of administrative agencies were in close touch with the masses, took counsel with them, heeded their opinions. Major legislation was publicly discussed before its enactment, and this gave it more appeal and force.

Perhaps this process, which we call the period of temporary forms of revolutionary power, lasted too long. Now, when the party and the political understanding of the people are much more mature, we have started work on a programme of consistent development of socialist democracy and on completing the building of our socialist state structure. The process began after 1970, when Fidel Castro called for strengthening the party apparatus, clearly delineating its functions and those of the government, raising the role of the trade unions and the other mass organisations.[1]

Work on our socialist constitution began in 1974. The draft was published on February 24, 1975, and opened to discussion by the entire people and its mass organisations, such as the CDR, the Trade Union Centre, National Association of Small Holders, the Cuban Women's Federation, students societies and the Young Communist League. Party members had an active part in all the discussions. The first Party Congress approved the draft after considering all the suggestions and comments made in the nation-wide discussion. After the referendum held in February 1976 the draft constitution became the fundamental law of the land.

The congress also decided to change the administrative division and establish local popular government throughout Cuba before the end of 1976. This was followed, in October, by elections to the municipal assemblies, which in turn elected members of the provincial assemblies. In November the municipal assemblies elected members of the National Assembly, which held its first session on December 2, 1976, the 20th anniversary of the landing from the yacht "Granma". This completed the organisation of popular rule organs at all levels.

What made it necessary to recarve Cuba's administrative map, and what are the functions of the institutions mentioned above?

The old administrative divisions remained after the revolution, though there were some rather haphazard changes. In addition to the six provinces, there emerged districts, a sort of intermediate link between the provinces and municipalities increased from 126 in 1959 to more than 400. This caused some confusion, and local problems did not always get proper attention from the national leadership. The new administrative map takes into account such factors as geographical conditions, population, social and economic problems and development potentials Everything has been put on a more rational basis, with closer contacts between the centre and the local authorities. This makes for more independence at local level and more efficiency at national level. One essential gain has been a considerable reduction of personnel: instead of six provinces we now have 14, and instead of a multitude of municipalities there are 169. And so we have a three-tier structure: municipality, province, national government.

The local assemblies operate in close contact with the mass organisation encourage the initiative and have the support of the population. They enjoy

wide measure of authority in their particular areas. For instance, they are in charge of local industry, services, schools, cinemas, transport, i.e., of all economic and social affairs. They also assist industries run by provincial and national agencies.

The municipal assemblies are elected by direct vote with one member for each constituency.[2] Members are elected from a list of nominees. This is how the system works: every constituency is divided into from two to eight election wards. Each ward nominates one candidate by majority vote; each voter can put forward only one name. In nominating candidates party members do so on their own behalf, not on behalf of the party, which does not itself put up candidates. A voter who nominates a candidate describes his life, work and service to the revolution, after which a vote is taken. Usually there are about six or seven nominees and the one who obtains more than half of the vote becomes the candidate.

There is no election campaign as it is understood in capitalist countries. Photographs and brief biographies of the candidates are widely displayed: a person who attended his own ward meeting does not know the nominees from the other wards. The biographies are also read out at residential block meetings by the CDR. In general everything is done to put all the candidates on an equal footing, so that no one gets preferential treatment. Every citizen decides for himself whom to vote for. It is forbidden to circulate cartoons of one's "opponents", or to make election promises. That is how it will be in future, too.

There are at least two and a maximum of eight (though in most cases there are three to five) candidates in each constituency. If no one obtains a clear majority, a second round is held between the two top candidates. The first round was held on October 10 and the second on October 17, with about 5.5 million, or more than 95 per cent of the electorate, casting their votes. They elected 10,725 members of 169 municipalities, men and women who truly represent the people. The new assembly members include active revolutionary fighters, workers, peasants and intellectuals. The elections were characterised by a high level of political activity, with each voter free to express his will. The elections were a vivid demonstration of our people's revolutionary unity, its unity with the Communist Party, its unshakeable loyalty to socialism and communism.

Of the approximately 30,000 registered candidates, 70 per cent were party and YCL members. Though we did not strive for such a high proportion, it is nevertheless a gratifying indication of the people's trust in the party, convincing evidence of the high prestige its members enjoy.

On October 31, the municipal assemblies met to elect executive committees, composed of a chairman, vice-chairman, secretary and a small number of full-time and free-time officials. The executive meets twice a month to deal with current business.

The supreme authority of state power is the National Assembly, the embodiment of the people's sovereign will and the only source of legislation. It elects the State Council, which performs many of the Assembly's functions between its sessions and is responsible to the Assembly. The chairman of the State Council is also Prime Minister, and it is on his recommendation that the Assembly appoints Ministers and elects the Supreme Court.

The new local and central organs of popular rule will play an important part in the system of economic planning and management we are now introducing, fo[r] they will decide on the many practical questions arising in the course of socialis[t] construction.

The recent elections were the first really free elections in Cuban history. Unde[r] the old constitution, voting was obligatory: refusal to vote was a punishabl[e] offence. Ours, in contrast, are free elections: everyone decides for himself whethe[r]

or not to go to the polls. Before the revolution members of the armed forces had no right to vote. Today servicemen are part of the people, or, in the words of Camilo Cienfuegos,[3] soldiers are the people in uniform. We have granted them all civil rights; they can vote and be elected to government bodies at all levels. The franchise extends to all citizens, regardless of race, sex, social origin, cultural level, etc. The only exceptions are those sentenced to prison terms and the mentally ill.

The voting age is 16, and at that age one can be elected to the municipal and provincial assemblies, but members of the National Assembly must be over 18. Our experience in Matanzas province[4] has fully justified the 16-year voting age, though at first there were some doubts. For example, one of the most active deputies of the Matanzas provincial assembly was elected when she was only 17, and now she is a member of the National Assembly.

Before the revolution, election campaigns were occasions for all manner of scandals, abuse of candidates, unrealistic promises and boundless corruption. Votes were bought and sold, and rigging an election was by no means a rarity. In fact, many a time it was found that the ballot box contained more ballots than there were voters. The rural guard, or the police in the towns, would often carry away the ballot box and do the counting themselves. Some election practices now seem incredible: in rural areas votes were bought for a pair of shoes. When the voter promised to vote the "right way" he was given the left shoe, when he came out of the polling station he was given the right one.

That is how it was in the past, with most candidates representing the ruling classes.

Our party took part in several elections to the pre-revolutionary Constituent Assembly (in 1940, 1944 and 1948). In 1940 we won six seats and used them to maximum effect. We sometimes likened ourselves to a spur urging on a big horse. And we did spur on the rest, with the result that several progressive laws were enacted. The bourgeois Constitution protected the private property of the US monopolies and local capitalists. In fact, its purpose, as that of the political structure, was to maintain the exploiters in power. They controlled the army, police, the courts and this told at election time. There were many other obstacles to working people's representation.

These are all features of so-called representative democracy in an exploitive society. If the ruling element sees that its interests are in danger—even if the danger does not come directly from the proletariat—democracy is cast aside. In 1952, for example, everyone expected the "orthodox" party, which spoke for big business and the big landowners, to win. But there was an energetic youth group within the party unconnected with oligarchic circles. It was expected that the new government, though it would not venture any fundamental changes, would nevertheless produce some mildly progressive reforms. To prevent that, a coup was staged, bringing to power the tyrannical Batista régime.

Why do we say that Cuba has given its people free elections? Because all our work is atuned to the interests of the masses. There are no exploiters, only working people—industrial and white-collar workers, peasants, professionals, whose interests coincide, in the main, though there are differences in the degree to which each of these groups has approached our socialist aims. But all of them are following the socialist path and find solutions for their own and for society's problems.

That is the very essence of our socialist democracy, a specific form of proletarian dictatorship. All classes and strata have one and the same aim, but the working class, associated as it is with large-scale production and processing the most developed sense of collectivism, is the motive force of this process. That is why Article 5 of our Constitution says: "The Communist Party of Cuba, the organised

Marxist-Leninist vanguard of the working class, is the supreme leading force of the society and the state; it organises and directs the common effort to attain the noble goal of building socialism and advancing to communism."

I would like to dwell on the right to recall deputies. The voters can recall any deputy if he fails to justify their trust. Every elected deputy is required to pledge to defend the country, the revolution, the cause of the working class and the people; consciously and voluntarily to accept the leading role of the Communist Party in our society; dedicate all his strength, not sparing life itself, to the building and consolidation of socialism; uphold socialist law and order. This is a serious pledge, and anyone failing to honour it loses his elective post. Members of the municipal assembly can be recalled by the constituents, and members of the provincial and national assemblies by the municipal assemblies. Such is the fate of a person who places himself above his electors, as happens in so-called representative democracy when, once elected, a man thinks only of his own or class interests, with scant regard for those who voted for him. In Cuba the people have the right to recall any elected official. We are thus putting into practice the principle proclaimed by Marx and Engels and based on the lessons of the Paris Commune. The right of recall applies to all members of all elected bodies.

In shaping our structure of popular rule we carefully studied the experience of the Soviet Union and of other socialist countries. We studied their constitutions, sent comrades to other countries to learn more about the way popular government works. We also took into account our own traditions In his famous speech, "History Will Vindicate Me", made in court after the attack on the Moncada Barracks, Fidel Castro outlined the principles of our democracy, the principles of our revolution. And, needless to say, we have taken into account the experience accumulated over the past years. For instance, at first we appointed commissioners to run the municipalities; later they were joined by several officials and later still we created *Jucels* (co-ordinating and supervisory councils); this was already collective leadership. Then we combined the two in a new local government pattern. Finally, we introduced the present form of elected local government. Thus our early experience proved useful and we applied it in building the new mechanism of government.

The elections held in 1976 confirmed anew the irrefutable truth that socialism and democracy are indivisible.

---

[1] An Executive Committee of the Council of Ministers was set up and the apparatus of the Party Central Committee was enlarged. The trade unions were strengthened and held their 13th Congress. It passed decisions covering practically every aspect of trade union activity, examined the complex problems of industrial relations and general economic problems.

In 1973 we took a further step in perfecting the socialist machine of government with the law on the judicial system, based on socialist law and order. Later on, with socialist construction gaining momentum, we streamlined our legislation: the old laws that no longer fitted into the new judicial system were repealed.

[2] The smaller municipalities have at least 30 deputies, i.e., one from each of its 30 constituencies. The larger assemblies can have as many as 200 members.

[3] Camilo Cienfuegos (1932-59), a hero of the Cuban revolution.—*Ed.*

[4] See "Building Up a System of Representative Bodies", by P. Margolles, *WMR* February 1975.

The 25th CPSU Congress and Questions of Marxist-Leninist Theory

PYOTR FEDOSEYEV
Central Committee member, CPSU,
and Vice-President, USSR Academy of Sciences

The Link Between Revolutionary Theory and Practice

UNITY of theory and practice is central to effective revolutionary activity. That has been so ever since the proletariat first entered the political arena as an independent class force. In our time, with the international working class and its creation, existing socialism, holding the initiative in world development, unity of the science of society and the progress of society acquires especial significance.

The CPSU, the Party of creative Marxism founded by Lenin, has always, in all its activities, combined undeviating fidelity to the principles of Marxism-Leninism with its uninterrupted creative and innovative development. The history of the CPSU is Marxism-Leninism in action. Its contribution, as that of other Marxist-Leninist parties, to the theory of scientific communism is based on generalisation of the Soviet Union's epochal experience and on the achievements of world socialism. The constructive effort of the masses is thus given a theoretical interpretation.

Study of the theoretical problems involved in building developed socialist society takes on much greater importance. In this context the experience of the socialist community is of immense value to the world liberation movement, for existing socialism is the highest form of social organisation in our age. Its achievements are exerting a growing influence on world affairs, the revolutionary processes and the progress of humanity.

But Marxist-Leninist theory does more than mirror these processes; it illumines the path of party and people to their ultimate goal and provides ideological guidance in their advance to that goal.

Developed socialist society, built in our country and under construction in the fraternal countries, is the result of the creative development and consistent practical application of Marxist-Leninist theory. And it is to the credit of our parties, the working class and working people of the socialist community, that by their dedicated labour they brought to reality the Marxist-Leninist principles of socialism.

The Marxist-Leninist theory of the regularities and main stages of building communist society has been confirmed, concretised and carried further in the process of socialist construction. The CPSU congresses, at which the party's collective experience finds its fullest, deepest and concentrated expression, are landmarks in our party's theoretical and practical activity.

And an event of truly epochal importance was the 25th CPSU Congress. Its materials, notably General Secretary Leonid Brezhnev's report on the party's immediate tasks in home and foreign policy, are of fundamental importance for the continued development of theory and practice in our own party and the world Communist movement, and for a clear understanding of the regularities and problems of building communism, and of the processes at work in the world.

The congress noted that much had been done in the past five years for a closer understanding of the problems of Marxism-Leninism of our time. For us, social scientists, Comrade Brezhnev's statement that significant headway had been made

in philosophy, economics, history and in the study of social and political problems, is a source of inspiration. It is only natural that Soviet scholars should feel gratified in the knowledge that their research contributes to the party's theoretical work, to elaboration of the scientific problems involved in perfecting mature socialist society and in communist construction in the Soviet Union. Our research has a bearing on the political and economic development of the socialist world system and on the world revolutionary process.

However, our achievements in the social sciences provide no grounds for complacency. The congress policy documents and Comrade Brezhnev's report set new tasks, and clearly oriented social scientists on in-depth analysis and its practical implications.

The theoretical points discussed at the congress are a convincing rebuttal to the calumnious attacks on Marxist-Leninist social science which, it is alleged, is in a stage of "stagnation", "sclerosis", and so on and so forth.

The 25th CPSU Congress approved a special section on science in its decision on Guidelines for the Development of the National Economy of the USSR for 1976-80. It lists the main tasks of the social, natural and technical sciences, on the accomplishment of which largely depends the development of the economy, culture, and of science itself.

The list of basic research areas begins with the social sciences. This should not, of course, be taken to mean that the natural and technical sciences are of less importance. But in this day and age of revolutionary change and the building of the new society, the uppermost question is how best to utilise the achievements of science and technology and for what purpose; what social goals can be attained by combining the technological revolution with the advantages of socialism. The reply must come first of all from the social sciences.

The key task the congress assigned the social sciences is broader and deeper study of the problem of expanding production and assuring its efficient management. In other words, scientists are expected to recommend methods substantially to raise economic effectiveness. The congress emphasised that this and other research lines directly geared to economic progress are inseparable from continued fundamental research in the theory of scientific communism. Accordingly, we are concentrating on the laws governing the transition from capitalism to socialism and communism, the theoretical problems of developed socialist society in the USSR, formation of the communist world outlook, problems of the socialist world system, and socio-economic and political processes in the capitalist world and in the developing countries.

A Programme for the Social Sciences

Higher standards of scientific research depend to a considerable degree on better planning, in particular on working out concrete programmes tied to fundamental research, but having important practical implications. There are eight such priority programmes:

—basic economic and social problems of developed socialist society and the regularities of its growing over into communist society;

—the theory and methods of economic planning and management in developed socialism;

—regional economic and socio-economic development up to the year 2000; establishment and upbuilding of major economic complexes;

—the social and economic problems of population and manpower resources;

—cultural development and education in a mature socialist society;

—regularities governing the development of the socialist world economy, socialist economic integration, expansion and tightening of long-term economic ties with the socialist countries;

—research into the economies of leading capitalist and developing countries; Soviet foreign economic ties with these countries; new developments in international relations and analysis of the foreign policy of the main capitalist countries;

—development of the international workers' movement and the world revolutionary process.

It should be emphasised that all programmes are regarded as equally important. Furthermore, we regard research results as the groundwork for practical recommendations on communist construction and the party's foreign-policy activities.

All these problems are, by their very nature, comprehensive and call for closely co-ordinated effort by social scientists working in different fields, and also for interaction of the social, natural and technical sciences. Comprehensive research is an underlying principle of the scientists's work, a principle dictated by the very character of the problems we have to solve.

We have built up a fund of experience in this. Comrade Brezhnev told the 25th CPSU Congress that institutes of the USSR Academy of Sciences, jointly with the appropriate ministries and departments, have drawn up a Comprehensive Programme for Scientific and Technical Progress and its Social and Economic Effects for 1976-90. The Congress also called for further work on this programme as an organic part of current and long-range planning, providing the signposts for efficient economic management.

In elaborating the Comprehensive Programme, the USSR Academy of Sciences is guided by the party's long-range economic policy of consistently raising the people's material and cultural standards through dynamic and balanced development of the economy, its higher effectiveness, accelerated technological progress, higher productivity and quality standards.

Developed Socialism and Our Time

Far from slackening, the study of these problems encourages closer research of all the components of Marxism-Leninism. One example is the present work on the theoretical problems of developed socialist society, now one of the most relevant aspects of Marxism-Leninism.

The 25th CPSU Congress amplified and concretised the propositions formulated by the 24th. First, it defined the characteristics of developed socialism in the USSR, indicating the necessary steps for its economic, social, political and cultural advance. Second, it worked out the economic strategy of developed socialism and set the tasks for the next five years and for a longer, 15-year period.

The congress drew not only on Soviet experience, but also on that of countries that have entered the socialist stage and are now also faced with the task of defining the prospects of developing socialist society. More, the conclusions drawn by the CPSU have stimulated collective formulation of a common policy on these problems by most of the socialist countries. They are faced with the task of building a developed socialist society; in the Soviet Union the task is to perfect it.

In developing and perfecting socialist society, the CPSU and the fraternal parties have made a weighty contribution to Marxist-Leninist theory on the following questions among others: the ways and means of building the material and technical foundations of developed socialism and communism; economic integration as the material basis of the socialist community; improvement of socialist production relations and their economic mechanism; obliterating essential distinctions between town and country, physical and mental labour, and changes in the socio-class structure of socialist society; the underlying principles of fraternal friendship of socialist nations and the ways of strengthening their unity; development of the socialist state and extension of socialist democracy, the conditions required for the state of proletarian dictatorship evolving into the state of

the entire people; the growing role of the Marxist-Leninist working-class party in developed socialist society as the party of the entire people; ways of asserting and cultivating the socialist way of life; the formation and development of the personality.

The experience of the once backward national outlands of Russia, the example of the Mongolian People's Republic and of several other countries provides vivid confirmation of Lenin's proposition that a country can bypass the capitalist stage of development in the transition to socialism. That has been conclusively demonstrated also by the fact that a number of young national states have adopted the socialist orientation.

The close co-operation of the fraternal parties in building and defending socialism, their joint struggle against imperialism, for peace and national independence, has highlighted the importance of correctly combining national tasks with internationalist obligations.

Soviet social scientists are studying new aspects of Lenin's analysis of imperialism, notably its uneven development, in application to the present-day world. Lenin's thesis that the objective and subjective preconditions, economic, political and ideological, for revolution mature at different times in different countries, and even within one and the same country, has a special significance today. Of particular importance is the conclusion he drew from his analysis of imperialism's uneven development, namely, that mankind's advance to socialism is bound to *find expression in different forms while retaining the essence of socialism.* Lenin wrote: "All nations will arrive at socialism—this is inevitable, but all will do so in not exactly the same way, each will contribute something of its own to some form of democracy, to some variety of the dictatorship of the proletariat, to the varying rate of socialist transformations in the different aspects of social life" (Coll. Works, Vol. 23, pp. 69-70).

This question of different forms of transition to socialism is being debated throughout the liberation movement. This adds to the value of Marxist-Leninist theory and the practical work of the CPSU and other fraternal parties in refashioning society in accordance with the general laws of socialism and the specifics of each country. All the more so that some are inclined to discard the cardinal principles of Marxism-Leninism, regarding the laws of socialist revolution and socialist construction as obsolete and replace them by "new models".

However, different approaches to socialism have been tried and tested in theory and practice, and all the bourgeois-reformist concepts of "democratic", "humane" "market" and all other bogus socialisms have proved ineffectual. For many year: the Social-Democrat leaders have been at pains to discredit the Marxist-Leninis theory of revolution and proletarian dictatorship, maintaining that capitalisn could be transformed into socialism through evolution. Social-Democratic partie have time and again been in government; in some countries they were the govern ment and had every opportunity to carry out their plans. But in no country wher they were, or are, in power has socialism made a single step forward. For ever where the Social-Democrats opted for partial reforms, leaving the foundations ‹ capitalism intact. And when the ruling class and international imperialism ha doubts about "democratic socialism", its exponents in government were se packing.

Nor has the concept of "barrack communism" proved any more successful. found its ugliest expression in negation of the economic laws of socialism, intr duction of petty-bourgeois levelling and a military-bureaucratic régime, unbridl chauvinism and hegemonism in foreign policy.

Those of us engaged in the social sciences appreciate the magnitude of t research we will have to undertake. For our society has reached a stage when t ... principles of the development of the communist formation have to

rendered more concrete and a blueprint worked out for transition to the highest stage. And outstanding among the problems involved is building the material and technical foundations of communism, improving socio-economic relations, developing the state of all the people and cultivating the socialist way of life.

Extending the material and technical foundations of developed socialism can be considered the prelude to building the foundations of communist society. The principal factor here is combining the achievements of the technological revolution with the advantages offered by the socialist system. In its theoretical aspects, this is a problem of the dialectics of productive forces and production relations. For whereas in capitalist society technological progress, though accelerating expansion of the productive forces, aggravates the contradiction between the social character of production and private capitalist ownership, under socialism technical progress, the chief expansion generator, is stimulated by socialist production relations. But to combine the technological revolution with the advantages of socialism, we must improve production relations, particularly economic planning and management. That is why the party lays such stress on these questions, which are also central to the work of economists and other social scientists. It is already clear that building the material and technical foundations of communism calls for more emphasis on the social aspects of technical progress in developed socialist society.

Soviet social scientists are working on many other problems. I would like to briefly discuss two of them to illustrate the creative development of social science in the Soviet Union.

In the past few years, philosophers, economists, jurists and historians have been exploring theoretical problems relating to the economic activities of the state and the relation between economics and politics under developed socialism. Some maintain that the state remains an element of the superstructure, a political and legal organism whose economic activities stem from the inherent economic and organisational functions of the socialist state. Others argue that, with its growing economic role, the state can no longer be considered an element of the superstructure and becomes a "dual" institution, combining elements of both superstructure and basis.

The discussion brought out several important problems requiring further theoretical probing. The important thing, however, is the start made in conceptualising, from position of dialectical materialism, processes now taking place in our economy. And another important result: the need for closer analysis of the dialectical interconnection of basis and superstructure under socialism. Development of socialism's economic basis helps to strengthen the socialist state, enhance its role in resolving social problems, provides the groundwork for expansion of democracy and consolidation of public order. Conversely, perfection of the political system, the administration and the extension of socialist democracy are powerful accelerators of economic progress, for they bring into the process an ever-wider segment of the population and stimulate creative effort.

Developed socialism does not weaken, but rather strengthens, the state by releasing all the latent potentialities of socialist democracy, encouraging loca initiative and participation of the masses. The decisive factor here is the leadin role of the working class and the Communist Party in the political system o Soviet society.

The growing economic strength of developed socialism, the more efficier functioning of its social and state mechanism, are the basis for asserting an consolidating the socialist way of life. This has become the subject of livel discussion. Some scholars virtually equate the way of life with economic, politic and social conditions, thus bypassing the problem of cultivating the socialist wa of life. Others define the way of life as a code of conduct, with scant regard t

objective conditions, which are seen simply as an external background. But this leaves out of account the fact that consciousness, behaviour are determined by people's conditions which, in turn, are changed, transformed by human effort. However, most take the dialectical view that the way of life is the totality of behavioural forms in inseparable unity with the conditions provided by socialist society. That is the direction that our research follows.

International Significance of General Laws

The revolutionary process furnishes ample confirmation of the Marxist-Leninist theory of the fundamental laws of social development. It confirms the *inevitability* of the world's transition from capitalism to socialism and provides irrefutable proof that it can proceed only through the active social creativity of the masses, and only under the leadership of the working class. It proves that if the revolutionary political gains are to be made durable, there must be social and economic change, a change in the forms of ownership.

Revolutionary practice poses also other questions reflecting the profound social and political changes in the world of today. Some of them are now being debated in the international working-class movement and, needless to say, Soviet social scientists cannot pass them by. It is important, we believe, to get down to the heart of the matter and ensure that the search for the truth, the exchange of views, should serve the common cause of the working class and socialism, and not their enemies, who are trying to inflate differences in the world revolutionary movement for their own ideological and political ends.

An in-depth scientific analysis of reality is the most reliable basis for correct theoretical judgments and conclusions, which we contrast to those we hold to be wrong. The main method is theoretical discussion backed by scientifically valid evidence.

These new attitudes and pronouncements are largely conditioned by the changed situation, by the problems confronting the Communist movement and the various contingents of the liberation struggle. History does not stand still; new situations arise, new alignments of forces, new developments in the class struggle.

Communist theoretical thought is oriented on finding the most effective ways of utilising the new objective opportunities for revolutionary change, of how to adapt our tactics to the changing conditions in one or another country. It need hardly be said that the best answers come not from hasty, inadequately thought-out conclusions, but, as we know, in the end the Communist and working-class movement always puts everything in its proper place.

We Soviet scholars think our social science can best help the international Communist movement by analysing the new phenomena and processes, bringing to light new forms and methods in the fight for the Communist refashioning of society, and by generalising and popularising the momentous experience of the CPSU and the great achievements in building socialism and communism.

As we see it, the job is to explain and concretise, in adaptation to our times, the fundamental conclusions of Marx, Engels and Lenin on the world-historic mission of the proletariat, the role of its revolutionary party, the regularities of socialist revolution, the necessity of proletarian dictatorship (in diverse forms) in the transition period from capitalism to socialism, the relation between the struggle for democracy and the struggle for socialism, the essence of proletarian internationalism, the relation between national and international tasks.

The coming 60th anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution give Soviet social science a fresh stimulus in exploring the ways and forms of revolutionary change. And in this respect a very important place belongs to the international implications of the October Revolution in its broad and narrow sense to use Lenin's words. In short, we should show the historic link between the chie

processes of our own time and the October Revolution, analysing such of its features which, as subsequent experience has shown, have a more general validity.

Towards More Effective Research

We appreciate that, in the light of the 25th CPSU Congress decisions, research must be raised to a higher qualitative level. Fundamental research in the social sciences must be made more effective, brought closer to life, to Communist construction and the foreign-policy activity of the party and government. We are working towards that goal by improving the planning and co-ordination of research and fostering closer ties with the natural sciences. Much is also being done to train personnel and streamline the organisation of research.

Among the more general tasks set by the 25th Congress, I would mention promotion of a creative atmosphere, fidelity to principle and partisanship. In his report, Comrade Brezhnev treated these aspects of scientific work as indivisible.

The congress also drew attention to the role of the social sciences in the offensive against anti-communism, in criticism of bourgeois and revisionist theories and in exposing the falsifiers of Marxism-Leninism. All this comes within the Leninist principle of the partisanship of science, its effective role in the fight for the triumph of our progressive social system and progressive world outlook. Measures are being taken to put an end to scholastic theorising and useless abstract discussions.

Research can be made more effective also by tighter schedules, wider use of computers and by better information facilities.

Intensification of scientific research includes also closer co-operation with colleagues in the socialist countries and Marxist-Leninist scholars in capitalist and developing countries. Such contacts are steadily increasing.

Soviet social scientists are working on the premise that Leninism is not confined to Lenin's lifetime. Marxism-Leninism develops through the theoretical work of the CPSU and fraternal parties, and is enriched by the experience and collective thought of the world Communist movement. Despite all the allegations that Marxism-Leninism has become "obsolete", the great teaching of Marx, Engels and Lenin lives and develops in the battle for the triumph of socialism and communism.

Party Experience

A Victorious Democratic Revolution

KONSTANTIN ZARODOV
Dr. Hist. (USSR)

POLITICAL freedom and social revolution, the interests of the people and the class strivings of the proletariat, democracy and socialism—these questions are uppermost in people's minds everywhere.

And often enough it is claimed that they arose and acquired political weight only recently. No doubt, these problems have acquired new facets in the concluding quarter of the 20th century, and hence it would be wrong to make a dogma of the past. But does that mean that, in their essense, they were not posed and solved in the past? The best answer to that will be found, I think, in the concrete experience of history.

On the eve of the 60th anniversary of the February 1917 Revolution—the first victorious people's revolution in the age of imperialism—it is especially instructive to analyse from this standpoint some of the main aspects of this democratic revolution and its inseparable link with the subsequent winning of power by the working class and the birth and assertion of socialism as a living reality.

I

Nowadays anti-communist ideology tends to revolve around the denial of the leading role of the working class in democratic transformations; also the thesis that its Marxist-Leninist vanguard does not share the democratic aspirations of the masses and their fight for political freedoms.

Representatives of the most diverse schools of bourgeois historiography maintain in particular that evidence of the inevitable parting of ways between the revolutionary working class and democracy is provided by the march of events and the alignment of forces prior to and during the bourgeois democratic revolution in Russia in February 1917. The overthrow of tsarism, the winning of political freedoms, democratisation of public life—all this, we are told, did not involve participation of the Leninist party, nor the organising and guiding role of the proletariat. February, it is argued, came as a complete surprise to Lenin and the Bolsheviks.[1] Bourgeois ideologists affirm, in effect, that in 1917 the Bolsheviks shunned the very idea of democratic revolution and did not believe that it could happen in Russia. To judge how this squares with reality, it is best to look at the facts. And that is what I propose to do.

First, let us ask: How did the various political parties assess the situation and its revolutionary potentialities in the years preceding the February revolution? All the main classes and political trends realised the need for social change. The bourgeoisie and its parties—from the conservatives, represented by the Octobrists and down to the liberals, represented by the Constitutional Democrats (Cadets)—were aware that the tsarist régime was rotten to the core and could not effectively uphold their class interests. Hence, the demands and actions to "improve" the power structure, remove the incompetent and discredited high-placed officials and extend their own share in the political administration of the country. Opposition sentiments were at high tide.[2] But on the whole the bourgeoisie was not thinking in terms of revolution, nor did it intend to encroach on the monarchy. All it wanted was to give it a democratic façade.

Petty-bourgeois democracy made up the other influential trend in Russian politics. Its policy was most clearly expressed by the social-reformists, notably the Mensheviks. The thinking and calculations that went into their political strategy was spelled out in the model devised by Plekhanov. It called for a gradual shift of power from the tsar to the conservative-moderates, then to the bourgeois-liberals and subsequently, at some indefinite and distant future, to the left parties.[3] And though Plekhanov himself believed this to be the "ascendent line" of the revolution,[4] actually it was very remote from anything resembling revolution. It was a typical example of reformist gradualness. Naturally, it eminently suited even the conservative bourgeoisie inasmuch as, according to this scheme, it would be the first to gain full political power.

Though this is, needless to say, a very general outline of the attitude of the bourgeois and petty-bourgeois democratic forces, it allows for the conclusion that the revolution came as a complete surprise to them, as a bolt from the blue contrary to all their plans and forecasts.

What were the views and aims of the Bolsheviks in this situation?

For a number of years preceding the revolution all the activities of the Leninist Party, its slogans and organisation, were determined by its assessment of the situation as a revolutionary one. In 1913 Lenin wrote in his analysis of the political

crises maturing in Russia: "In most cases it is not enough for revolution that the *lower classes should not want* to live in the old way. It is also necessary that *the upper classes should be unable* to rule and govern in the old way. That is what we see in Russia today" (*Coll. Works*, Vol. 19, p. 222).

And Lenin emphasised that the development of a revolutionary situation into revolution can come about only if it is consciously organised by the political forces interested in such a revolution. From this followed his concrete instructions to prepare the party for an active, leading part in the popular rising. And such preparation included ideological and organisational strengthening of the party's ranks and a firm rebuff to liquidationist and reformist tendencies. It was also important to keep alive and develop among the workers and the masses generally the militant experience of the 1905-7 Revolution.

A magazine article does not permit a detailed account of the Bolsheviks' concrete steps to organise the revolutionary working-class movement following the defeat of the first Russian revolution, the specifics of their work, conducted in the incredibly difficult conditions of illegality,[5] the fórms and content of their propaganda in the press, the mills and factories. The reader who wants to form an objective picture of that will find the necessary information in the widely-published documents contained in any really scientific Marxist study.

The Bolsheviks' manifold activities began even before the outbreak of World War I and were clearly oriented on an early revolution. That should be stressed, for latter-day bourgeois propaganda is fond of reviving the legend that Lenin and the Leninists relied entirely on the war, considering it little short of a heaven-sent advantage for revolutionaries. In reality, however—does this generally-known fact need to be proved?—the Bolsheviks were the most consistent and resolute opponents of militarism and the looming world holocaust. When the imperialist war broke out, it both objectively, and in the estimation of Lenin and his party, was a factor that exerted a contradictory influence on the prospect of revolution. For, first of all, it dulled the acuteness of the revolutionary situation and befuddled the political consciousness of the masses by the opiate of chauvinism. But it was bound to aggravate all the vexing problems of society. In January 1917 Lenin had every justification for his statement that we should not be misled by the apparent "grave-like silence" on the fronts of the class struggle, and that we were on the threshold of a revolutionary explosion. A few weeks later the events in Russia were to confirm that forecast.

It therefore follows that if anyone was caught unawares by the February revolution, it was not the Bolsheviks. And certainly not Lenin who, incidentally, gave a clear-cut characteristics of the revolution, formulated the prospects of continued revolutionary struggle and the growing over of bourgeois democratic into socialist revolution. This he did immediately after the February events, and not in April, i.e., after a month-long period of "adapting to the new situation", as some publicists have been at pains to make out.

II

Our opponents never tire of repeating that the struggle and successes of the working class and democratic forces do not vindicate the Marxist-Leninist theory of revolution which, they insist, should be abandoned as a "constrictive stereotype". A frequently-used supporting argument is that Lenin's concept of democratic revolution in the age of imperialism and its growing over into socialist revolution was refuted already in February 1917. This is their line of reasoning. First, according to Lenin, the revolution could triumph only with the establishment of the dictatorship of the working class and peasantry, whereas in reality political power in post-February Russia passed to the bourgeoisie. Second (and this follows from the first), February demonstrated, "contrary" to Lenin's concep

that in this 20th century, as in the pre-monopoly era, hegemony of the proletariat is not a necessary condition for the victory of a democratic revolution.[6]

Every system of state power is a form of class dictatorship. Our critics are all the more persistent in their attempts to refute this elementary truth of Marxism, the more it is confirmed by historical practice. However, it should be stressed that we are dealing precisely with the system of power, its operative mechanism. For it should be perfectly clear that in periods of great revolutionary upheavals it is only logical that there should arise situations in which the integrated system of political administration of society disintegrates and is replaced by temporary, class heterogeneous power structures.[7]

The dual power, which lasted for several months after the February revolution, was precisely such a transitory variant of political administration in conditions of drastic intensification of class confrontations caused by the revolution. But did this mean that state power and political guidance of the revolutionary process were in the hands of the bourgeoisie? Did it signify the institution of the class dictatorship of the bourgeoisie? No. For along with the official government, another centre of power, the ramified system of Soviets of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies, established in those revolutionary days, exerted much more influence than the official government.

The Soviets drew their support from the insurgent people, from the mass movement, which was the main force of the revolution. Hence they exercised much more real and effective control of the situation than the Provisional Government.[8]

The political crisis that repeatedly shook the country after February clearly showed that the Soviets could assume full state power. This would have meant the institution of a revolutionary-democratic dictatorship of the working class and peasantry. For a long time Lenin's slogan "All Power to the Soviets!" was, in effect, an appeal to establish such a dictatorship. That would have put an end to the dual power, and in a way that corresponded to the interests of the labouring people, and would have set the revolution on a peaceful course. In reality, however, the inevitable end of dual power was brought about in a different way—through collusion of the compromisers, who at that moment had overwhelming influence in the Soviets, with the bourgeoisie. This led to a factual one-power structure of the Provisional Government subservient to the will of the exploiter classes. This made it necessary for the revolutionary forces directly to prepare for an armed rising.

Does that justify the conclusion that the post-February events proved (allegedly in contradiction to Lenin's concept) that the democratic revolution could have successfully developed without the dictatorship of the working class and peasantry? On the contrary, the post-February events provide absolute proof of the correctness of Lenin's concept, for they clearly demonstrated the bourgeoisie's inability to direct the process of revolutionary democratisation, its impotence at a time when the people were awakening to independent social and political creativity. The post-February events, especially after the attack on the July workers' demonstration, reaffirmed that, when it is impossible for representatives of the labouring classes to gain full state power, the inevitable result is the dismantling of all the gains of the democratic revolution and the advent of brutal reaction.

Lenin's concept of the bourgeois-democratic growing over into socialist revolution, comprehensively elaborated in 1905, was brilliantly and conclusively confirmed twelve years later, and it demolished, consistently and mercilessly, the reformist doctrine of the Mensheviks and SRs, who in 1917, as in 1905, harped on the purely bourgeois nature of the revolution and on the need, accordingly, to support the bourgeoisie and safeguard its interests.[9] With these concepts the compromisers tried to justify their treasonous activity, which led to the loss of the greatest gain of the democratic masses: the existence of the centre of political

power such as the Soviets, completely independent of the bourgeois government. Having joined that government, the compromisers made no attempt to direct the revolution—they directed its dismantling.

So much for the post-February events and the relation to the class content of state power as a factor in developing the democratic revolution. Let us now turn to the role of another major factor, the problem of class hegemony in a revolutionary process aimed at winning democracy.

Class dictatorship and class hegemony are essentially different concepts. And that has to be emphasised, for in their attempts to discover some contradiction between the aims of the democratic movement and the working-class struggle, bourgeois ideologists are at pains to distort the meaning of hegemony of the proletariat, reduce it to "institution of proletarian dictatorship", or even to "Communist Party domination". They attribute to the Marxist-Leninists the absurd intention of making the working class the hegemon, "using force if necessary".[10]

Lenin defined the hegemony of the working class as "the political influence which that class (and its representatives) exercises upon other sections of the population" (Vol. 17, p. 79). Precisely political and not administrative influence, not influence organised by the state or formalised by law. How did this hegemony manifest itself in the 1917 revolution in Russia?

First of all, it manifested itself in the circumstance that without the vanguard action of the working class, the February revolution could not have taken place at all.[11]

Secondly, in fact that the subsequent progress of the revolution was based primarily and chiefly on the workers' increasing militancy and the rapid growth of their class-consciousness and political initiative. The workers established their influence in society through the Soviets, put the factories under their control and formed the Red Guard.

During the February events and on innumerable later occasions, enemies of the revolutionary working class and the Bolshevik Party accused them of "going too fast", of trying to impose a "disastrous" pace on the democratic revolution.[12] Yet the year 1917, in particular the defeat of the Kornilov rising, showed that the Bolsheviks took strict account of the objective exigencies of development and that without the initiatives of the working class led by them, the revolution would have been doomed to an early failure.

Thirdly, the hegemony of the working class manifested itself in the fact that the progress of the revolution led rapidly and irresistibly to discrediting what had originally been very influential petty-bourgeois forces. Immediately after the February revolution, Lenin wrote, "a gigantic petty-bourgeois wave . . . swept over everything and overwhelmed the class-conscious proletariat, not only by force of numbers but also ideologically; that is, it . . . infected and imbued very wide circles of workers with the petty-bourgeois political outlook" (Vol. 24, p. 62). Obviously, this situation would inevitably have been perpetuated had the bourgeoisie found itself in the role of leader of the democratic revolution. But it is a fact of history that Russia's workers soon freed themselves from the mentality and ideology of the petty-bourgeoisie and petty-bourgeois reformists; this is, from traits alien to them. The strength and influence of the vanguard contingents of the working class, guaranteed by the workers' objective class hegemony in the revolution, won the upper hand.

Fourthly, the hegemony of the working class gave the revolutionary process a clear-cut social programme going beyond purely political changes, and shaped the policy that led to the October victory of the socialist revolution.

An oft-repeated view has it that what enabled Russia's workers to triumph in 1917 was not so much their strength as the organisational and political weakness of all other classes and social strata.[13] On the theoretical plane, views and estima-

tions of this kind are drawn on by both right-wing reformist and "leftist" doctrines. Trotskyism, for its part, bases its theoretical constructions on the notion of the "weakness" or "helplessness" of the Russian bourgeoisie and the revolutionary "immobility" of the peasants.

In reality, however, the Russian bourgeoisie was not as weak as it is sometimes portrayed. It controlled the country's entire economy. It had strong links with the governments and capitalists of the *entente* powers and was backed by their arms. In the end, it completely subdued its petty-bourgeois rivals represented by the conciliating parties. And there is ample historical evidence that the peasants constituted a vast independent revolutionary force, due especially to the fact that the majority of the army was recruited from their ranks and that they had an influential political organisation, the Socialist Revolutionary (SR) Party. Nevertheless, it was the working class that became leader of the revolution, and this was not the result of the weakness of others but of superiority in strength which the workers owed to their objective position in twentieth-century bourgeois society.

III

Bourgeois estimations of the 1917 revolution in Russia boil down to the following primitive formula: "The prospect of freedom opened up by February faded gradually in subsequent months owing to the Bolsheviks' revolutionary policy and was finally lost in October."[14]

It is an undeniable fact that the February victory brought the people serious political gains. In the early months after it, all political parties operated freely and openly. The revolution released all political prisoners from the tsar's prison and enabled political exiles to come back. Press censorship was abolished and newspapers of the most diverse trends were published unhampered. Public hall were made available to the people. Freedom of speech, assembly and demonstration was guaranteed. Elections to the Soviets of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputie and the unfettered functioning of these government bodies of the people were a unprecedented achievement of political democracy in a society whose social an economic foundations were still capitalist.

By the standards of the period, Russia turned out to be the freest and mos democratic country of the world.

At the same time, these gains of the people immediately furnished graphic con firmation that Lenin was right in describing political democracy under capitalism as "a freer, wider and clearer *form* of class oppression and class struggle" (Vol. 2: p. 145). Entirely in accordance with Lenin's forecast, the winning of democracy i Russia neither marked, nor could mark the end of the revolution; it was boun to and did open a new stage of revolutionary development.

Problems giving rise to violent class conflicts were plentiful. Prominent amor them were the ones which the people hoped would be solved by a consistent democratic revolution.

To begin with, the Provisional Government took the same stand on the ke issue of war and peace as the autocracy had. It declared its intention of perseveri in the imperialist policy of "war to the victorious end". This meant that as far the vast majority of the population was concerned, "freedom" was to be freedo to go on rotting in trenches and dying from bullets. The continuing war aggravat economic dislocation, dooming millions upon millions of civilians to poverty a starvation. The agrarian problem was still unsolved. Political democracy did n bring the peasants the smallest patch of land. The government opposed legislati establishing an eight-hour working day, which was the working people's mo elementary demand. No amount of reshuffling of the Provisional Governme could change this state of affairs.[15] In other words, post-February democracy—t widest and fullest as to political forms—was plainly betraying its class conte

It did not satisfy the workers and the masses at large, for it offered them no real way out of their plight. Nor could it entirely satisfy the bourgeoisie, for while it did not affect their economic positions or privileges, neither did it give them full political power.

The result was an uncertain situation in which even political democracy found itself threatened. The question was whether it was to exist at all.

What were the solutions proposed by diverse political forces and how far did their proposals accord with realities?

There is no point in speaking of the reactionary camp, of outspoken enemies of democracy and advocates of restoring police practices. As matters stood at the time, the main controversy was between the SR-Menshevik bloc and the Bolsheviks. Making common cause with the bourgeoisie, those petty-bourgeois conciliators tried to justify their policy by referring to the need to "preserve" democracy. What this meant in reality was, first of all, that they did nothing to bring about social and economic changes. Specifically, they insisted on putting off the peasant question until it was "democratically discussed" by the Constituent Assembly, elections to which were postponed again and again on various pretexts. Reformist leaders resisted every attempt to curtail the capitalists' privileges. This also applied to the eight-hour day, which the workers established without official permission, contrary to the policy of the government and its "revolutionary" ministers.

In short, while posing as defenders of democracy for the people, the SR and Menshevik leaders did their utmost to shore up the social and economic foundations of bourgeois reaction. They made a bid for social peace in a society rent by class conflicts, and sought "progress" through peaceful evolution in a revolutionary situation.

Yet the alignment of political forces was increasingly determined by the formation of two class poles—the bourgeoisie and the revolutionary working class. Here is an example:

In the June elections to local government bodies in Moscow, the SRs and Mensheviks won 70 per cent of the votes, the Bolsheviks 11 and the Cadets 17 per cent. In similar elections held in September, the Bolsheviks collected 51 per cent of the votes and the Cadets 26 per cent. The share of the two conciliating parties dropped to 18 per cent.[16]

It follows that the SR's and Mensheviks' "struggle for democracy", and the conciliators' entire policy, had nothing to do with the genuinely democratic aspirations of the people, who were moving farther and farther away from them for precisely this reason. It was becoming evident that the reformists were prompted by fear of real democracy.[17]

By contrast, the Bolshevik position on this issue was prompted by the desire to preserve the democratic gains of February and, moreover, by a clear idea of how this could be done in view of the given alignment of class forces. At the same time, on the theoretical plane, Lenin and his followers abided by the teachings of Marx and Engels, who stressed that the first step in the revolution by the working class is to win power (see Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, *Selected Works*, Vol. 1, p. 126).

"*We* have nothing to fear from real democracy," Lenin said, "for reality is on our side" (Vol. 25, p. 308). Developments in post-February Russia proved him correct. The working people were fast coming to realise that Lenin's Party was the party expressing their vital interests. This explains why the Bolsheviks were set on maintaining and furthering democracy.

To be sure, many people who are by no means biased fail to understand, none the less, why the Bolsheviks, who led the October armed rising, can be said to have saved the democratic gains of February. They see more logic in the bourgeois ideologists' allegation that October meant dissociation from the democratc gains

of February.[18] However, this is the logic of bourgeois ideologists and they ar right from their class point of view. They are right in so far as October reall meant the end of bourgeois class domination, which February had preserved an promoted, and in so far as October left no room in Russia for the bourgeoi variety of democracy. However, they are very wrong (they may be deluding them selves but in any case they are misleading others) when they say that democrac in Russia could have been "saved" but for the proletarian revolution.

The trend of revolutionary events put the question point-blank: either th political democracy won in February would be put on the solid basis of radica social and economic changes, or reactionary forces, using their unshaken economi might and their intact social privileges, would bring down the flimsy structure o democratic institutions in politics. Lenin's Party was the only left-wing party o the Russia of those days to grasp a problem inexorably brought to the fore b every popular, democratic revolution of the twentieth century.[19]

More than once between February and October the democracy existing at th time could have been preserved and furthered by peaceful means. The Bolshevik were the only party to *invariably propose using these opportunities for th* advancement of the revolution in a socialist direction, but reformist conciliator rejected the idea just as invariably. For this reason, the historical responsibility fo the fact that the democratic gains of February could not be consolidated b peaceful means alone falls on the parties of Russia's social reformism. By contras the Bolsheviks are entitled to full credit for preserving, consolidating and carryin forward the gains of the revolution in the face of all obstacles.

* * *

The foregoing invites definite conclusions.

First, the February Revolution forcefully demonstrated the class nature o political democracy. It showed that the winning of political democracy does nc terminate the revolutionary process.

Secondly, the experience of February is proof that the durability of the politica gains of the revolution depends in decisive measure on how far they are supporte with social and economic changes, which are the only means of depriving reaction' inevitable bitter resistance of the main source of its strength.

Lastly, February 1917 in Russia showed that while the formulas of Bolshevisr had been found to be "correct on the whole, their concrete realisation . . . *turne out to be* different", to quote Lenin (Vol. 24, p. 38). This means that the events o February and subsequent months were a further reminder of the impossibility o providing onself in advance with recipes ready for use. On the other hand, the imply that February confirmed the general and hence fundamental correctness o Lenin's view on the character of the democratic revolution in the period whe capitalism based on free competition gives way to monopoly and imperialis domination.

---

[1] That contention has been repeated by bourgeois authors, in practically identic wording, for decades. The February revolution "began in a small way, spontaneousl almost one might say, apolitically. . . . There were strikes, housewives' demonstration mutinees among the troops and police—a collapse of all authority. The movement too the revolutionaries by surprise as much as any one else." (L. Kochan, *The Making c Modern Russia*. London, 1962, p. 231.)

The Bolsheviks "appear to have done nothing to bring on the revolution of Februar 1917 and in the defensist climate of the war their power even to make trouble wa initially minimal". (J. Dunn. *Modern Revolutions. An Introduction to the Analysis c a Political Phenomenon*. Cambridge, 1972, p. 39.)

"Like the Revolution of 1905, the February Revolution took the political parties i

Russia, including the Bolsheviks, by surprise." (R. Theen. *Lenin. Genesis and Development of a Revolutionary*. London, 1972, p. 91.)

[2] The resentment spread even to the court camarilla; some even resorted to violence; for instance, the murder, on December 17, 1916, of Rasputin, the perpetrator of many of the crimes and much of the vileness of the tsarist régime.

[3] G. V. Plekhanov. *Two Lines of the Revolution*. Petrograd, 1917.

[4] Ibid., p. 7.

[5] During the war the Petrograd Party Committee was raided and destroyed at least 30 times. The frequency of the raids and arrests can be judged from the fact that at the close of 1916 and early 1917 they took place on December 9, 10, 18, 19 and January 2.

[6] Taking it as their starting-point, some contemporary authors are inclined to see the main difference between February 1917 in Russia and, say, the French revolution of 1793 in the "greater negativism of the Russian intelligentsia" (cf. *Revolutionary Russia—A Symposium*. New York, 1969, p. 179). That assertion by Professor Seton-Watson of London University is typical of the widely-held view of bourgeois historians and is in tune with the views of their theoretician colleagues, who maintain, as does, for instance, the well-known French sociologist and political publicist Maurice Duverger, that the "hegemony of the proletariat formula has lost all meaning" in assessing the motive forces of social progress in the 20th century. (M. Duverger. *Lettre ouverte au socialistes*. Paris, 1976, p. 54.)

[7] Something of the kind happened in Czechoslovakia; for instance, in the period preceding February 1948. Cuba, in January-February 1959, had a government headed by a bourgeois politician, but control of the country was in the hands of the Insurgent Army. In the three years of the Chilean revolution, the Popular Unity government, on the one hand, and parliament and the judicial system, on the other, represented conflicting centres of power. One of the most notable aspects of the Portuguese revolution is that deep-going revolutionary changes were implemented in the absence of an appropriate state apparatus. The revolutionary forces were represented in the organs of power (both military-political and governmental). But the forces of conservatism, even of reaction, were represented there, too.

[8] The correlation of forces between the Soviet and the Provisional Government was aptly described by the then War Minister, A. I. Guchkov: ". . . the Provisional Government does not command any real power and its orders are carried out only to the extent permitted by the Soviet of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies, which commands the key elements of real power, such as the army, the railways, the post and telegraph service. We can bluntly say that the Provisional Government exists only as long as it is tolerated by the Soviet of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies." (*The Revolutionary Movement in Russia After the Overthrow of the Autocracy*. Documents and Materials. Moscow, 1957, pp. 429-30.)

[9] Upon his return from exile in March 1917, the Menshevik leader Tsereteli deemed it his prime duty to express his gratitude to the Petrograd workers for their "two exploits". First, the overthrow of the autocracy, and, second, equally important, was Tsereteli told the workers that "you realised that a bourgeois revolution had been performed. . . . You gave the bourgeoisie . . . power. . . ." (*Izvestia*, No. 20, March 21, 1917.)

[10] That viewpoint is being popularised by a leading US bourgeois newspaper, *The Christian Science Monitor*. It alleges that for the Marxists-Leninists there can be "no genuine revolution without the 'hegemony of the proletariat'—i.e., dictatorship by the Communist Party. . . ." (*The Christian Science Monitor*, October 13, 1975.) Another leading US paper, the *New York Times*, has opened its pages to all manner of fabrications about the concept of hegemony of the proletariat serving merely as a screen for the Communists' intention "to seek domination over social forces from the very beginning." (*New York Times*, November 28, 1975.)

[11] Working-class pressure on the tsarist régime grew steadily from the autumn of 1916 on. Early 1917 saw a strike movement unprecedented in wartime. In January, over 450 strikes were called in 26 provinces, with the total number of strikers exceeding 350,000. According to data on strikes in 18 provinces in the first 20 days of February, there were 158 involving about 203,000 workers. Six strikes out of every ten in January and seven in February were clearly political.

Lenin's Party was the real organiser of working-class action. On January 9, it led the biggest political strike in Petrograd since the first Russian revolution. The Bolsheviks also led mass strikes and demonstrations of the capital's workers on February 14. Incidentally, it was on that day that the Mensheviks' attempts to channel the rising wave of the revolutionary movement in favour of reformist support for the liberal bourgeoisie were thwarted. (For details, see I. Mints, *Istoria velikogo Oktyabrya*, Vol. I, Moscow, 1967, pp. 470-87.)

[12] It was in this vein that the Menshevik *Rabochaya Gazeta* on April 6, 1917, attacked the revolutionary workers and their party led by Lenin. It alleged that the Bolsheviks were posing a threat to the revolution from the left, that the revolutionary process should be kept "within the bounds predetermined by objective necessity" and that therefore, "all struggle against counter-revolutionary aspirations and intrigues will be hopeless until we safeguard our left flank, until we render the current championed by Lenin politically harmless by firmly resisting it".

[13] This was, specifically, the consensus of opinion of numerous participants in a symposium sponsored by a group of US research centres in April 1967. (For an account of the symposium, see *Revolutionary Russia: A Symposium*, pp. 175, 176, 279, et seq.

[14] Something of a generalisation of various points of view that are at one, however, on this particular estimation of the relationship between February and October will be found, among others, in a six-volume book by a large team of West European and American bourgeois social scientists called *The Soviet System and Democratic Society. A Comparative Encyclopaedia*. The authors of this "encyclopaedia", supposed to be a scholarly work, points out that "historians" offer two basic estimations of the result of political development in the Russia of 1917. One estimation, which goes back to the Mensheviks and SR's, blames the Bolsheviks and the October Revolution for "emasculating and distorting Soviet democracy". The other says that the Soviets as such, and hence the parties represented in them, were responsible for the miscarriage of the "strenuous efforts" of the Provisional Government "to preserve the new order in Russia based on the principles of legal statehood and bring about stabilisation in line with parliamentary democracy, as well as democratic self-government".

The authors of the "encyclopaedia", expressing their own view, contend that in any case October meant "the downfall of revolutionary democracy". (*Sowjetsystem und demokratische Gesellschaft. Eine vergleichende Enzyklopädie*. Vol. IV. Freiburg-Basel-Vienna, 1971, pp. 924-8.)

[15] "We were marking time everywhere—in the army, on the agrarian question, on the issue of war and peace," Kerensky admitted afterwards, contradicting his earlier statements. "It is fair to say that the whole state was marking time, having been stopped by the Cadet hurdle." (A. Kerensky. *Isdaleka*. Sbornik statei, 1920-1, Paris, p. 235.)

[16] According to data cited by P. Milyukov, the Constitutional Democratic (Cadet) leader, in *Istoria vtoroi russkoi revolyutsii* (Vol. I, third instalment, Sofia, 1923, p. 8[illegible]

[17] The Mensheviks' dread of democracy and the people showed in statements by their leaders, who longed to transfer the Central Executive Committee of Soviets of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies, on which conciliators had held a dominant position since February, from Petrograd to "where one can work in peace, without pressure from the street". (See P. Milyukov. *Rossiya na perelome*. Vol. I, Paris, 1927, p. 78.)

[18] In an effort to back up contentions of this kind, bourgeois falsifiers of history also pose what they call the "bloodless democratic" February against the "bloody Bolshevik" October. They "forget" that during the February revolution, 1382 persons were killed or wounded in the streets of Petrograd alone, whereas the October rising proper took a toll of only eight to ten killed and about 50 wounded.

[19] "Only Bolshevism," wrote P. Struve, a prominent leader of Russian bourgeois liberalism, "was logical in the revolution and faithful to its essence, and that is why it achieved victory in the revolution." (Pyotr Struve. *Razmyshleniya o russkoi revolyutsii*. Sofia, 1921, p. 31.)

The Party and the Younger Generation

WOLFGANG HERGER
Member, CC SUPG, Head of CC Department

THE Ninth Congress of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany devoted special attention to work among the youth. Youth problems hold a prominent place in the Central Committee report to the congress presented by Erich Honecker, General Secretary of the CC, and in the debate and final documents of the congress, including the party's new Programme and Rules. It is worthy of note that 14.2 per cent of the delegates were under 25 years of age. The revolutionary devotion to the SUPG with which the young people of our republic, led by the Free German Youth (FGY) league, joined in preparations for the Ninth Congress is seen, among other things, in the fact that 109,935 young men and women, mostly workers and co-operative farmers, applied for party membership between July 1975 and April 1976.

The Tenth FGY Congress, held early in June 1976, a few days after the Party Congress, resolved to bring the ideological content of the Ninth Congress to the knowledge of our youth and mobilise them to carry out the congress decisions, defining this as a key task. A new mass movement was launched by our youth under the slogan "FGY assignment: Ninth Congress decisions".

The Ninth Congress generalised the fundamental principles that have always guided the party's youth policy, and adjusted them to present-day practice. The party bases its activity in this field on the theoretical works of Marx, Engels and Lenin regarding work among the youth, as well as on conclusions from the experiences of brother parties, primarily the CPSU. Creative application of the ideas which Lenin put forward in his speech "The Tasks of Youth Leagues" (October 1920; see V. I. Lenin, *Coll. Works,* Vol. 31, pp. 283-99) play an important part.

What are the principles and experiences from which our youth policy proceeds?

First, the strategy of continued social development adopted by the Ninth SUPG Congress also determines the party's youth policy. This is why the Ninth Congress and then the Tenth FGY Congress examined problems of the *communist* education of the youth so carefully. This position of our party follows the Leninist principle that the policy of the working class and its revolutionary parties towards the younger generation can only be based on their overall strategy. On the strength of Marxist-Leninist analysis of the progress made by society, the Ninth Congress called for "continuing to build a developed socialist society in the German Democratic Republic, thus creating the fundamental prerequisites for the gradual transition to communism". This means that today young revolutionaries in our country are trained and tested through active participation in building a developed socialist society and in providing these prerequisites. In other words, the communist education and revolutionary testing of the youth do not take place in isolation from fulfilment of the tasks set by the Party Programme but "in actual life, in actual labour, in the struggle for goals of our policy that promote the well-being of the people", as Erich Honecker put it.

Second, the party's youth policy has always been guided by the principle that the younger generation must be fully trusted and assigned positions of responsibility. The party, the state and mass organisations give much attention to young workers, the successors of the leading class of our socialist society.

This principle is by no means a subjective invention. It may be described as a

development law of socialist society, which implies that since the younger generation of today is to become the backbone of the society of tomorrow, it must prepare even now for its future responsibilities. Young people can do so only if they are always posted on current tasks in advancing socialist society and building communist society and are already entrusted with accomplishing these tasks along with their elders. We judge the youth above all by their attitude to labour and by their public activity.

That youth enjoy the confidence of fellow-citizens was demonstrated in the latest elections to the People's Chamber (October 1976)—young men and women of 18 were elected to this highest representative body of the republic for the first time (previously the required age was 21).

Third, one of the young people's primary tasks and duties is, now as in the past, to master the teachings of Marx, Engels and Lenin and be true socialist patriots and proletarian internationalists.

Only he who has thoroughly studied the works of the founders of communism and bases all his plans and activities on their teachings can champion the communist cause. We do not want people merely to memorise Marxist-Leninist tenets, but expect them to grasp their meaning and apply them creatively. "Those are not revolutionaries who show their knowledge of Marxism-Leninism with words alone", said Egon Krenz, alternate member of the Political Bureau, CC SUPG, and First Secretary, CC FGY, speaking to the Tenth FGY Congress. "Revolutionaries are those whose conscious activity for the good of the people shows how very deeply they understand the truth of the teachings of Marx, Engels and Lenin."

Fourth, the FGY is an active assistant and militant reserve of the party. The Ninth Party Congress defined the chief task of FGY according to this fundamental Marxist-Leninist conclusion regarding the relationship between the party and the FGY. This task "will be, in the future as well, to help the party in educating staunch fighters for a communist society who act in a Marxist-Leninist spirit". This presupposes application of the three fundamental principles of our youth policy listed above, as well as full and all-round party support for the FGY and the Ernst Thälmann Young Pioneer Organisation, so that they may honourably perform their objective function as an assistant and reserve of the party.

Numerous proposals sent in by party organisations led to the incorporation in the Party Programme of a provision saying that the party "considers it a class duty of all Communists to regard the communist education of the youth as their special responsibility". The Rules, for their part, state that "it shall be the duty of all party organisations of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany to guide the full and candidate members of the party active in the Free German Youth".

Ideological work, it was pointed out in the CC report to the Ninth Congress, "remains the pivot of party work. Party work does not mean operating inanimate objects but persuading and mobilising people in every sphere of public life". This fully applies to the party's communist education of the youth. Our party is aware that communist consciousness is not a quality that can be inherited and that communist convictions do not form automatically, due to the existence of favourable social conditions.

The party and FGY are now carrying on extensive ideological and political work intended to acquaint young people with the theoretical wealth of the Ninth Congress decisions. Just as Erich Honecker, speaking to the Tenth FGY Congress, told about the Ninth Congress and the tasks facing the youth, so other members of the party leadership and congress delegates have addressed youth audiences. Political work takes the form of various mass events, rallies, youth forums, classes for FGY activists, FGY branch meetings, round-table talks and interviews with Ninth Congress delegates. Our schools and universities, for their part, convey Congress decisions to their audiences.

Party committees give a great deal of attention to the FGY political education system. Over 1,600,000 young men and women are studying the decisions of the Ninth Congress in classes for Young Socialists. The Marxist-Leninist education of young party members and candidates is very important. We take account of the fact that over 12 per cent of them are in the 18-25 age group. Lectures for youth organised by the Urania society (over 16,000 series), Young Philosophers' Clubs and Youth Propaganda Days, which involve hundreds of thousands of young workers, students, young intellectuals and servicemen, have proved their worth.

Our party promotes the formation of a socialist way of life by the youth and extends facilities for leisure pursuits. And here, too, young workers get priority. Ninety per cent of all youth teams work according to cultural education plans made by the teams themselves. By carrying out their cultural education programmes dedicated to major public events, such as the Ninth Congress, FGY branches contribute to cultural progress. Activities of this kind are generously subsidised and encouraged to ensure that the theatre, cinema, concerts, books, records, dance music for the youth, political song clubs, the Gifted Youth Movement, amateur art groups, sports and tourism meet young people's manifold requirements to a greater extent and help cultivate their world outlook.

The party also does much for the Marxist-Leninist steeling of FGY cadres. They receive their political education in group leaders' schools (in FGY branches), in political education classes conducted by FGY committees, at seminars for the advanced training of full-time FGY secretaries and in FGY district youth schools. Numerous FGY activists take instruction or advanced training in the party's educational institutions.

Our experience has shown that training the youth in a spirit of devotion to the ideals of the working class and instilling in it such revolutionary traits as responsibility, organisation, social activity, a creative approach, intolerance of obsolete views and behaviour patterns, requires more than giving it theoretical knowledge; we must also give it a practical share in building socialist society. The SUPG is guided by Lenin's injunction: "Without work and without struggle, book knowledge of communism obtained from Communist pamphlets and works is absolutely worthless" (Vol. 31, p. 285). Consequently, Communist education implies unity of Marxist-Leninist study and participation in the struggle to build the new society. One's approach to his work is the touchstone of his attitude to the Communist ideals.

Accordingly, the SUPG encourages delegating to the youth a meaningful part in solving the problems facing our society. Most party organisations and industrial managers make a point of explaining to the young people the intricate problems of economic development and what they can do towards their solution.

Young people are often put on major economic assignments. They have a significant part to play in such key projects as the gas pipeline from Orenburg to the western borders of the USSR. Young Berliners have undertaken responsibility for the further improvement of the capital. At these and other projects hundreds of thousands of young men and women are showing a true revolutionary spirit, and it is here that the Communist mentality and code of conduct are shaped.

Addressing the 10th Congress of the Free German Youth, Erich Honecker said: "Your organisation's economic initiatives, whether exhibitions or creative work by young technicians and scientists, or the movement to economise on working time and materials, can produce appreciable results measurable in marks and pfennings. And in the course of this work each of you, and our society as a whole, gains new experience, new knowledge, and strengthens the socialist attitude to work."

The SUPG attaches special importance to equipping the youth with solid tech-

nical knowledge and helping it achieve high skills. Under socialism, science and technology are a testing ground of the revolutionary commitment of the young generation. And here, too, our party abides by the principle that the young generation must be given responsible assignments. More and more research programmes—now widely known as "Youth projects"—including some of national importance, are assigned to teams of young workers, engineers and scientists.

The party also attaches much importance to the organisation of teams of young workers and co-operative farmers. The following four factors determine their importance: they help to shape the Communist mentality and the Communist code of conduct; encourage innovation and strive for high performance indicators; play a big part in training skilled personnel; provide a political and organisational base for FGY activity in industry and agriculture. The number of such teams has increased from 15,685 in 1971 to 26,006 at the close of 1975 and their membership from 199,725 to 300,195. The SUPG supports the FGY campaign for 10,000 new teams by 1980.

Of immense importance in educating the young generation, beginning with childhood, and in particular in inculcating respect for work, is the practice of front-rank workers sharing their experience with school pupils, apprentices, students and young workers. The Ninth SUPG Congress stressed the responsibility of the working class and its trade unions for educating the growing generation and working-class influence on the youth is direct and multiform. The SUPG is guided by Marx's dictum: ". . . the more enlightened part of the working class fully understands that the future of its class and, therefore, of mankind, altogether depends upon the formation of the rising working generation." (Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, *Selected Works*, Vol. 2, p. 80.)

Socialist patriotism and proletarian internationalism, taken in their unity, constitute a key element of Communist education. The Ninth SUPG Congress expressed this unity in the following five principles. The youth, the Congress declared, should address its energies to strengthening the GDR; promoting still closer fraternal alliance with the USSR; closer ties with the countries and peoples of the socialist community; the defence of socialism; anti-imperialist solidarity. This, of course, implies uncompromising struggle against all imperialist attempts to smuggle in and spread bourgeois and anti-Communist ideology.

Attitude to the Soviet Union is central to the internationalist education of the youth. Invoking the behests of Ernst Thälmann, Erich Honecker declared at the Ninth Party Congress: "Firm ties with the Party and country of Lenin are fundamental to a class approach, the decisive criterion of a revolutionary and internationalist." That is indelibly engraved on the minds of our young peopl The FGY is in contact with the Leninist Komsomol of the Soviet Union and wi youth organisations in other socialist countries at all levels. In some cases the contacts are based on long-term agreements. All FGY regional, 80 district ar 4,480 primary organisations have co-operation agreements with Komsom organisations in the USSR. The international contest for the title "Best Worker One's Profession", exchange of youth teams by GDR and Soviet factori organisation of international students' brigades to work on the principal sociali economic integration projects, co-ordinated measures to assure high-quality sta dards and scheduled delivery of export goods to the socialist countries, joint wo on youth projects, more tourist travel and a wide range of sports events—they a all expressive of the firm bonds of friendship of the youth of our countries a contribute to the coming-together of socialist states and nations. Still anoth element in international education are the periodic exhibitions of work by you technicians and scientists held in the Soviet Union and other socialist countri Then there are the "friendship runs", a joint undertaking by young industrial a railway workers and young people employed in the foreign trade system of t

GDR, Poland and the USSR to expedite the transport of goods between the three countries.

The GDR-USSR youth festivals help to strengthen friendship with the Soviet Union and other members of the socialist community. The SUPG devotes much attention to educating the growing generation in a spirit of anti-imperialist solidarity. The FGY from the very outset supported the liberation struggle in Angola, Mozambique, Guinea-Bissau and the Cape Verde Islands. Solidarity with the peoples of Vietnam, Laos and Kampuchea assumes many different forms. The GDR youth is proud of its part in the campaign to free Angela Davis, Luis Corvalan and now has an active part in the campaign to free other imprisoned Chilean patriots. Millions of solidarity cards were sent to Comrade Corvalan on his 60th birthday. Our youth has been unstinting in its support of the Arab peoples, particularly the people of Palestine, in their just struggle for liberation. It also supports the peoples of Namibia, Zimbabwe and South Africa. And this support has its material expression: volunteer work since the 10th FGY Congress has brought 1,800,000 marks into the anti-imperialist solidarity fund. FGY teams are helping train skilled workers for the emergent states of Africa, Asia and for Latin America.

The striving for peace, security and happiness is characteristic of the young generation. The FGY had a prominent part in the European youth and students' Conference for Durable Peace, Security, Co-operation and Social Progress (Warsaw, June 1976). It called for a European youth conference for armaments limitation and disarmament, at which the FGY will be represented. It sent a delegation to the World Conference to End the Arms Race, for Disarmament and Detente (Helsinki, September 1976). Our youth has responded to the call for the 11th World Youth and Students' Festival in Havana in 1978 by intensifying the anti-imperialist solidarity movement.

Our young people love their socialist Fatherland and are prepared to defend it at any moment. But their life and work are imbued with the spirit of proletarian internationalism, friendship with the Soviet Union and militant anti-imperialist solidarity. The SUPG regards educating the youth in this spirit as an important aspect of its work.

One of the main conclusions the party has drawn from its experience in Communist education is that the youth should be seen not merely as an "object" of education, but rather as a force capable of participating in the shaping of the Communist mentality and the Communist attitude to work.

The Free German Youth League, a mass political organisation, plays an important part in this. It unites, on a voluntary basis, young men and women of all classes and strata of the GDR. Its core are the young workers. The SUPG considers the political unity of the young generation, symbolised by the FGY, as an outstanding achievement of its Marxist-Leninist youth policy.

Communist education of the youth is impossible without a viable and effective political youth organisation. Its success depends also on party leadership. This is expressly stated in the FGY constitution: "The Free German Youth League functions under the leadership of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany and considers itself the party's active helper and militant reserve. All its activities are based on the programme and decisions of the SUPG."

The party's political guidance is designed to promote FGY initiative and enhance its authority. The party encourages and supports FGY membership activity and helps to strengthen its primary organisations, and thus its contact with our young population.

Of course, the party takes into account the growing responsibility of the FGY and its greater role in Communist education. It regards youth work as an inseparable component of its entire activity. Top-level party bodies guide the wor

of the FGY, both through general and special directives. For instance, the decision of the CC SUPG Politburo on measures to implement the resolutions of the 10th FGY Congress prompted party organisations at all levels to adopt measures to help the FGY to organise the mass movement under the slogan: "Fulfilling FGY assignments means fulfilling decisions of the Ninth Congress."

The party sees to it that the FGY has a proper share in the affairs of state. The youth law enacted in 1974 on the party's initiative—the third such law since the proclamation of the GDR—makes it obligatory for industrial managers to support the initiatives of young workers and their organisations and give the youth concrete and responsible assignments. The FGY is represented in the municipal councils and the People's Chamber. All in all, there are 19,405 deputies representing the FGY and another 10,175 under the age of 25.

The SUPG devotes much attention to building up the party core in the FGY, helping it to prepare front-rankers for party membership. Last, but not least, it shows special concern for the training of young candidates and full members of the party. Party assignments, usually within the FGY, fulfilled with the help of experienced party members, gives them a clear idea of how the party operates. Regular talks with young Communists have proved their worth, as have also conferences and meetings of party activists on questions of youth policy.

These are some of the methods the SUPG employs in guiding the Free German Youth and in raising the effectiveness of its activities. This strengthens mutual trust between the party and the youth.

The Lessons of Chile

Second article[1]

Stages of the Struggle

ORLANDO MILLAS
Political Commission member, Communist Party of Chile

THE tasks of the Chilean revolution are still valid. The democratic changes planned by the people in the recent past are more indispensable than ever. The establishment of a brutal fascist régime that turned back the country's development made it particularly evident to the vast majority of Chileans that none but a radical solution of the serious problems left unsolved would meet their interests and aspirations. This is not to say, however, that the inevitable return to these problems implies a repetition of the past. The tragedy of recent years has not been in vain.

We all learned much since the coming of fascism—both those who backed the government of President Allende and those who were opposed to it even though they shared many of its objectives and anti-fascist position. At present all the problems appear in a new light. The need is for a broader coalition based on a more perfect conception. Hence analysis of what was done, of the gains and shortcomings of the revolutionary process of the 1970-73 period, far from throwing us back to the past, can help us to grasp the problems of the present and future.

A statement released by the Communist Party in Santiago in September 1976 said again that the chief task was to defeat fascism and restore democracy and that this task must unite and mobilise the whole people. It noted that the struggle for social freedoms and democracy is central to all revolutionary activity. The

Communists' proposals are aimed at co-ordinated action by all patriots to bring down fascism. Furthermore, they envisage definite commitments to "build a more democratic political system than before, one that would grant more freedoms while preventing the restoration of fascism".[2]

Life has shown that the Communists were right in rejecting nihilist attitudes to democracy. Lenin's ideas regarding the importance of the struggle of the workers and the people for democracy are particularly relevant today. We view the democratic tasks and socialist objectives of the Chilean revolution in their dialectical unity and consider their realisation to be one process having its political and socio-economic stages.

The concept of popular revolution is the best definition of our process. As far back as the early fifties, the Communist Party, drafting its Programme, subsequently approved by the Tenth National Congress, renounced the term "bourgeois democratic revolution". It held that such a term was likely to cause a certain confusion at a time when, with the rise of a financial oligarchy and the growing role of imperialism, the dominant policy of the bourgeoisie was acquiring an explicitly reactionary meaning. However, the party rejected a simplistic analysis of social contradictions. It pointed out that there were contradictions between the interests of the financial oligarchy linked with imperialism and those of other sections of the bourgeoisie. It expressed the opinion that the tendency to deny the differentiation going on among the bourgeoisie and prematurely attribute a socialist character to the process, far from helping to accomplish consecutively the tasks necessary to pave the way for socialism, actually made it more difficult.

Classically, the revolutionary process has a democratic and a socialist stage. The names of these stages do not mean that they are entirely different; on the contrary, stress their interconnection. Indeed, while no socialist tasks are set at the first stage, it sees the realisation of democratic tasks which afterwards are carried further and acquire a new content, with the result that there develops a democracy capable of serving as a form and instrument of the socialist revolution.

We regard the anti-imperialist, anti-oligarchic and agrarian revolution as the democratic stage of the advance to the socialist revolution. The party's definition of the working class as "the centre and motor of revolutionary changes", which is determined primarily by the very nature of our epoch, the epoch of transition from capitalism to socialism and communism on a world scale, became a slogan of the working class, helping it to unite the masses in a struggle for goals meeting the interests of the whole people. Thus a powerful anti-imperialist movement led by the working class came into being, and parliamentary forms of struggle and political action merged with action by the masses. This process itself took place against the background of international contradictions and in the context of their evolution. The role of democratic demands in drawing nearer to the socialist revolution became more pronounced. The character of bourgeois legality and bourgeois institutions was modified in the people's interests.

All this is inseparable from the fact that the Communist Party considered the possibility in non-armed revolution of using also forcible means against imperialism and reaction, a vast variety of forms of struggle, with emphasis on fostering the revolutionary consciousness, unity and organisation of the masses and on their links of alliance. This theoretical proposition of the Communists was confirmed by a peaceful transition, so that major democratic revolutionary changes were envisaged and effected.

An important aspect of the revolutionary process was that Chile's workers and people were steeled in class struggles. They came fully to realise their strength widened their political horizons, strengthened their will, fought their way to power and ruled the country for three years. They crushed a series of conspiracies and carried out far-reaching changes by nationalising the major copper and iron

mines, transferring the saltpetre and coal mines to the state and establishing a public economic sector by socialising the banks, big monopoly-owned industrial enterprises, and the major foreign and home trade concerns. They accomplished an agrarian reform eliminating the latifundia and transferring the land to peasant co-operatives, redistributed the national income in the working people's favour and adopted an independent foreign policy. The people's participation in government was given a powerful spur.

The popular revolution in our epoch has both allies and dangerous, aggressive enemies. Fulfilment of the tasks of the democratic stage of the revolution arouses suspicion, hatred and aggressive hostility on the part of imperialism. The case of Chile dramatically confirms this. The fascist coup was openly directed by the multinational companies affected by nationalisation, in direct collaboration with the CIA and Pentagon. Home reaction was encouraged to step in by US imperialism, with its sinister plan to "destabilise" the Popular Unity government, defeat democracy in Chile and impose a fascist tyranny, an outspokenly terroristic dictatorship of the most aggressive forces.

The principal allies of every popular revolution are the Soviet Union and other socialist countries, the working-class movement and all anti-monopoly forces of the developed capitalist countries, as well as the national liberation movement. The revolutionary process enjoys the people's sympathy, support and solidarity. The Allende government was appreciated and generously aided by the Soviet Union, socialist Cuba, the German Democratic Republic and other socialist countries. It maintained cordial relations with most Latin American governments, fostered relations with the Andean Pact countries, signed highly useful agreements with various West European countries and established relations with Asian and African countries. Now that the peace forces are gaining influence and detente is making headway, there are more favourable conditions for the popular revolution. However, it will become impossible if concessions are made to anti-Sovietism and if it is attempted in isolation from the common stream of the progressive forces of mankind.

Chile's revolutionary forces were not disheartened by their temporary setback. They are as loyal to their fundamental views as ever. "The Communist Party," said the party in its first statement after the coup (released in October 1973), "is absolutely convinced that its advocacy of unqualified defence of the Popular Unity government, its steps to reach understanding with other democratic forces, above all at grass roots, its effort to inspire the middle strata with confidence and direct the main blow against the principal enemies—imperialism and home reaction—its perseverance in strengthening the Socialist-Communist alliance and working-class unity and in promoting understanding among the Popular Unity parties, its effort to achieve greater output and higher productivity, proper financing of the enterprises in the public sector and strict labour discipline constituted an entirely correct general policy. However, this does not rule out mistakes or weaknesses in its activity."[3]

Revolutionary progress at the democratic stage, with socialism as a prospect, expresses itself in increasing interaction in the political, ideological, social and economic spheres. This can be achieved given the hegemony of the working class, which is the decisive factor for the unification of all democratic forces in a broad and solid alliance, as has already been said.

The Communist Party realised that it must uphold its independent class line in the movement for unity, a line aimed at uniting all revolutionary forces, resisting all deviations and safeguarding the future of our revolutionary process. And this means that the party bears special responsibility for shortcomings and weak spots in pursuing that line.

The dialectics of the multi-party system and of united and firm leadership had

distinctive features in Chile. There developed a broad and flexible unity implying unity of the working class itself, its alliance with other working people and understanding between it and other democratic forces. In the conditions of the revolutionary process, this unity was based on the existence of a strong and influential Communist Party, Communist-Socialist unity, which was a factor of the first importance, and an effective Popular Unity bloc comprising the Communist Party, Left Christian Party, Movement for United Popular Action (MAPU), Worker-Peasant Party, Radical Party, Socialist Party and Independent Popular Action. This unity was also based on temporary agreements with other political organisations, in particular on an agreement with the Christian Democratic Party intended to assure the election of Allende to the Presidency by the entire Congress and carry out constitutional reforms relating to "democratic guarantees" and the nationalisation of the major copper mines. Besides, friendly relations were established with the Catholic Church and other churches. In October 1972, an agreement was reached under the Popular Unity Programme with the command of the armed forces, which adhered to a democratic position and supported the Constitution. This found expression in the formation of a cabinet led by General Carlos Prats from November 1972 to March 1973 and in its well-known statement and its plan for establishing a public sector in the economy.

We revolutionaries cannot accomplish the revolution by ourselves but must, if we are to succeed, bring into the revolutionary process those strata that are objectively interested in the revolution but generally vacillate. Experience shows that this issue is settled in the most diverse forms. One of these forms, the multiparty system, became in Chile a means of consolidating forces in joint action, in serious political battles and in working out a common programme respecting the independence of every member of the alliance.

As the revolutionary process goes on, however, social classes and strata constantly come up against new problems and new tasks and are influenced by its laws. Life amends programmes, especially when revolutionary activity accelerates the pace of history like a powerful locomotive. This makes it necessary for a multi-party coalition to have a sufficiently united and firm leadership capable of developing its own programme, consolidating gains and defeating reaction. Otherwise the revolution finds itself threatened.

Revolutionary talk, the temptation to give priority to "competition" in recruiting forces, the stratagems of right- and "left"-wing opportunists and the formation of poles dividing the progressive camp are likely to weaken a popular government to a disastrous extent. The harsh lessons of Chile are most revealing in this respect. However, it is obvious that the unity of the revolutionary forces has withstood the ordeal of temporary reverse. This is evidence of the solidity of the foundations of unity. Communist-Socialist unity today goes deeper than in the past; the Popular Unity coalition has arrived at better mutual understanding and the unity of all anti-fascist forces, including the Christian Democratic Party, has gained in scope through joint action. Even so, this problem and all that has happened must be analysed still more carefully if the anti-fascist struggle is to become more effective and attain its goals.

The past quarter-century has been a substantial growth and centralisation of capital in Chile. In this period, life itself impelled the middle strata to put forward democratic demands meeting their interests and running counter to the interests of imperialism and monopoly. The formation of the Allende government was the result and culmination of a sustained struggle throughout which the domestic big bourgeoisie and imperialism endangered democratic freedoms, rights and institutions by constantly attacking them while the working class, the Communist Party and its allies campaigned for demands meeting the interests of the nation and of progress.

Due to the struggle of the working class and the people, a relatively modern democratic state was formed in Chile. In spite of the bourgeois character of this state, a struggle for power went on in it for a long time, especially between 1970 and 1973. The earlier, anti-democratic class content of the state, determined by the exploiters' interests, coexisted with democratic gains registered afterwards. The only way to consolidate these gains and set the goal of achieving socialism was to press forward the revolution and destroy the traditional anti-democratic structures.

This is a problem that we think no revolution can avoid. Some Chileans imagined that they could bypass it by uttering freedom-loving generalities or with the aid of anarchist catchwords and appeals disguising their weakness in the actual struggle against reaction. However, experience confirmed, and still confirms, that this kind of opportunism, which puts abstract things first for "bona fide" reasons while concealing concrete things in favour of momentary interests, becomes the most dangerous variety of opportunism, which Lenin warned against in *Marxism on the State*.

The connection between the two stages of the revolutionary process also manifests itself in the link between the respective class components. The democratic stage is characterised, in addition to a definite class composition of its motive forces, by the breadth of their alliances. Progress towards the socialist stage does not necessarily narrow or reduce these alliances. In fact, the revolution integrates forces. He who musters more forces wins. The working class must ensure that the bloc of forces which unite to bring about revolutionary changes is stronger than the bloc backed by imperialism.

Events in Chile revealed that the struggle for democracy and socialism demands unfailing vigilance, for the enemies of democracy exploit every passing superiority in strength to counter-attack. This is why problems of decisive importance must be discussed and made understandable to the masses long before they become the order of the day.

Experience shows that the indecision of the middle strata could have been foreseen. It was vastly important to follow a clear-cut and firm yet sufficiently flexible policy towards them, a principled policy that would have prevented imperialism and reaction from making the middle strata the social basis for the fascist rising. (Family ties and the social origin of most officers of the armed forces, who came from the middle strata, played a notable part in this.)

The class struggle intensifies as the tasks of the democratic stage of the revolution are carried out, and demands concerning the advance to socialism become more emphatic. In these circumstances there is no ignoring the issue of what class is ruling society, how it succeeds in mobilising an active majority and how far it is able to maintain and exercise its power. The extension of the social basis of the revolutionary process in step with its advance at the democratic phase confronts the working-class vanguard with bigger tasks and if its organisational and political growth is lagging behind the growth of the popular movement, it may find itself trailing behind events when new objective conditions mature.

The anti-monopoly and anti-imperialist democratic tasks of the revolution are accomplished depending chiefly on the solution of the contradictions of the given régime. However, every socio-economic formation is a dialectical whole complete in itself. It follows that the intricate dialectical relationship between social contradictions makes it possible to skip stages or consider them to be very far apart.

The Chilean revolution refuted the narrow-minded concept treating all the ruling classes as the chief enemy and drawing no distinction between big landowners, rich and middle landowners, the monopoly oligarchy, diverse sections of the national bourgeoisie and the middle strata. Ultra-leftists sharing the concepts accused the Chilean revolution of "reformism". It is indicative, however, that

attacks of this nature were widely made by the mass media, as well, which took an active part in the efforts to "destabilise" the popular government and clear the decks for the fascist coup.

Imperialism and reaction realised, of course, that the democratic, anti-imperialist, anti-monopoly and anti-latifundium revolution was paving the way for socialism. The experience of the 1970-73 period shows indeed that consistently democratic measures intertwined with rudiments of socialism. As a result of the changes carried out, the development of the Chilean economy became chiefly non-capitalist. The decisive sector of the economy stopped serving capitalist accumulation. In this situation, the process of reproduction objectively necessitated the replacement of the production discipline imposed by monopoly with a new discipline conditioned by the hegemony of the working class. It was necessary to establish greater worker control over production, introduce planning throughout the economy and base management on efficient functioning of the public sector and the agrarian reform sector.

We know from experience that unless we consolidate the positions we have won and are firm in carrying the revolutionary process deeper, we may risk having to retreat all along the line. Counter-revolution not only strives to prevent the transition to socialism but opposes all democratic guarantees. This is why, in self-critically analysing the Chilean events, we consider it very important to ascertain why we did not in the course of the revolutionary process take appropriate steps when objective contradictions increased, as might have been expected because this is a law of every revolution.

The fact that the formation of a popular government, the recognition of President Allende's electoral victory and the realisation of democratic changes were made possible was due to the solid unity of the working class on fundamental issues and actions, to the correct orientation of the working class and the wide range of its links of alliance, which enabled it to use organisational forms in keeping with current tasks. But subsequently the situation became more complicated, the enemy stepped up his resistance and the working class and its allies in the democratic camp had to build up their strength. The point is that as the revolutionary process went deeper the bourgeoisie, including those of its sections that had been hit by monopoly domination and benefited from the popular government's measures, tended more and more to proceed, above all, from the fact that their interests were contrary to those of the working class. This tendency was also encouraged by abstract talk about the socialist future without regard to the actual tasks of the moment. However, the most negative and destructive factor was that the working class failed after all to win effective hegemony; instead, the dominant policy trend was duality and concessions, made to both right- and "left"-wing opportunists.

In April 1972, the Communist Party gave warning against the impending danger and, with a view to bringing about decisive progress, stressed the need to raise the role of the working class, establish a united and strict system of economic management, consolidate the gains made and isolate the more dangerous enemies. Subsequent developments showed only too plainly, however, that this line was not pursued with adequate determination. After the defeat, it was justly pointed out that "we carried on discussions and clarified our class position at the level of the leadership; but we did not encourage discussion at grass roots, among the people, sufficiently to prevent the spread of petty-bourgeois revolutionaries, which injured Socialist-Communist unity and hence the revolutionary process".[4]

The split in a united and mobilising leadership became a factor for defeat. Opportunism spread in two interconnected trends. The ultra-leftists, denying the revolutionary character of the process under way, tried to impose their own notions of its development and strove, in effect, to disrupt it from within. On the

other hand, the reformists overrated the peaceful aspects of the process and made a fetish of undemocratic institutions that were out of keeping with the new and more important tasks brought to the fore by life. Paradoxically if not unaccountably, these two varieties of opportunism constantly backed each other, being prompted by their bias against the Communists.

Analysing the results of those years, we must note that the revolution succeeded in setting up democratic institutions of a new type and developing higher forms of democracy. In some fields, it began to combine government with popular self-government. Supply and price control councils became widespread. They were led by an outstanding revolutionary, Marta Ugarte. Housing councils and mothers' committees and defence committees were formed. The trade unions began to assume leading functions in the social sphere. Management in industry and trade was being transformed step by step and a system of people's inspectors elected by the trade unions and supply councils was being set up. Their communal offices operated in collaboration with mass organisations. The United Workers' Centre (CUT) helped to establish its industrial belt councils. A national economic plan for 1974 was being drafted with the participation of the masses, which became a reality in enterprises belonging to the public sector and in the agrarian reform area. A number of treaties were signed between the Ministry of the Economy and the staffs of certain enterprises relating to the amount of output, labour productivity, raw materials supply, credit terms, wage levels, prices and investment. *The working class, strongly backed by the youth and intellectuals, succeeded in* maintaining order in the country during the employers' sabotage in October 1972 and August 1973.

However, no transitional situation proper was created during the revolution; that is, the revolution did not entirely achieve its democratic and anti-imperialist objectives to pave the way for socialism. This required greater democratisation and the abolition of the privileges and political power of the imperialist monopolies and the financial oligarchy. It also called for a new system of leadership in society that may be defined in scientific terms as the dictatorship of the working class and the masses of town and countryside, or people's power.

The Chilean events showed that it is very dangerous not to carry democrisation through to the end, and that it must be carried through as early as possible. This certainly implies defence of the people's democratic rights against counter-revolution by suppressing counter-revolutionary, anti-democratic activity. The Communist Party and Popular Unity realised that the power of domestic and foreign imperialist monopolies conditioned both certain basic aspects of the exercise of parliamentary authority and other, equally important, activities in industry and the military sphere. This is why Luis Corvalan insists so often that success in elections is not the most important thing in the advance of the popular forces, but only part of the complex development of a broader social struggle. Accordingly, the party constantly warned against the danger posed by the euphoria of those who imagined that the September 1970 election had guaranteed the development of the socialist socio-economic formation. At a time when we had won power only in part, it was essential to democratise every field of activity, to carry out far-reaching democratisation measures in economic management, extend democracy to the judiciary and the control machinery, achieve a balance of forces in favour of democracy among the military and bring the administrative system into line with genuinely democratic standards. We stopped half-way in this respect The Popular Unity government failed to establish effective democracy in decisive fields. Its gains, while impressive and highly noteworthy, were clearly inadequate

Nevertheless, the tremendous headway made in this direction opened the eyes of millions of Chileans to reaction's falsehoods about the revolution. Everyone saw for himself that the revolutionary process brings the people greater freedom

assigns them a bigger public role and affords them unprecedented opportunities to raise their cultural standards while respecting the religious convictions and the customs and traditions of every population group.

All this has lost non of its importance. The position of the Church and the mutual understanding that links non-party Catholics and Christian Democrats with Popular Unity in defending human rights are based primarily on their own experience of the attitude of the government, the Communists, Socialists, Radicals and left-wing Christians towards the Christian rank and file. Besides, most Chileans discarded at a certain moment their illusions about the "independence of judicial power" and the "neutrality of the armed forces". Above all, the working class has become more conscious politically. This is seen, among other things, in its insistence on united and independent trade unions continuing to operate even amid fascist terror. The working class—and the majority of the people with it—have come to see in a state functioning in a society of class antagonisms a product of irreconcilable class contradictions.

The anti-democratic character of the decisive components of the old system of government stood out all the more when a number of democratic revolutionary changes were effected. That was when the strength of the popular government, its ability to maintain democratic changes and its activity aimed at pressing forward social changes and upholding what the people had won became particularly important. Karl Marx noted that "social reforms are never due to the weakness of the strong; they must, and will, be brought into being by the strength of the weak".

The ability to defend the revolution is central to every genuinely revolutionary process, irrespective of the path it is following. The democratic phase of the revolution needs to be consolidated and carried forward, and this is inseparable from defending the revolution. Defence of the revolution must begin at the stage it has reached, for this is the only way to ensure that it moves on to the next and higher stage. The experience of Chile points very clearly to the dialectical interlock and interdependence of action intended to overthrow the power of the ruling classes and resist counter-revolution and action mobilising the masses to build a new society. All this took place in the course of a most complicated class struggle and social and economic changes.

The defence of revolutionary gains is neither a conspiracy nor a task of small groups isolated from the people. It is based on the popular government's desire to express the interests and aspirations of the masses, on its ability to unite the masses and mobilise them for struggle, and on its dynamic and correct creative effort. However, all this is not enough unless the masses are able to strengthen the democratic government and state as exponents of the interests of the progressive forces. It is necessary continuously to modify the system of institutions and agencies if every component of power is to function in the interests of the working class, the people and the nation.

We Chilean Communists know by experience of the damage caused to the revolution and the people by weakness in the face of reactionary violence. We have come to the conclusion that the primary duty of revolutionary forces in accomplishing the tasks of the democratic stage is to be firm in their resolve to deliver crippling blows to all who resort to counter-revolutionary violence. The effort to mobilise an active majority of the people must be supported by an appropriate mass organisation which commands all requisite means and whose members have been properly educated and trained.

To go over from the democratic to the socialist stage, the popular forces must also hold positions enabling them to take the offensive, which is not tantamount to merely widening, step by step, the range of action in the matter of expropriation or to striving to expose as many enemies as possible. It is far more important continuously to further democracy in every sphere, as I have already pointed out,

strengthen the unity of the workers' militant action and raise the fighting efficiency of the party and its allies, increase the efficiency of the popular government and isolate counter-revolutionaries.

Why did the revolutionary leadership of Chile fail in this? I have said that there was a moment when, in exercising power and mustering forces to defend its positions, everything came to depend on how resolutely and effectively the leadership pursued its policy. It was essential to exercise democratic power, to use the authority vested in the popular government. But precisely because it did not raise problems with absolute confidence, nor carry on with adequate efficiency the everyday work necessitated by these problems, the policy adopted by the leadership failed to acquire a sufficiently mobilising quality.

The Popular Unity government should have been in keeping with the given stage of its tasks in both substance and form. It was a synthesis of the authority and strength of the people. There were shortcomings in its development, and many were misled by the propaganda of reformist and anarchist concepts of power carried on by both those who praised the former system and government and those who demanded "people's rule" as the antithesis of the Popular Unity government.

Thus, the temporary defeat of the Chilean revolution confirms the dialectical connection between democratic tasks and the socialist future, as well as the dialectics of revolutionary paths, which necessitates ability and preparedness to go over from one path to another at the right moment, as the situation changes. The fascist coup of September 11, 1973, showed that the enemy remembers these objective laws at all times, even when we forget them.

---

[1] For the first article, see *WMR*, January 1977.

[2] *Partido Communista de Chile. Boletin del Exterior.* No. 20, 1976, p. 8.

[3] *Desde Chile hablan los communistas!* Ediciones Colo-Colo, 1976, pp. 28-9.

[4] *Desde Chile hablan los communistas!*, p. 88.

In Brief

BRITAIN

A new draft of the Party Programme, *The British Road to Socialism,* has beer discussed in the Executive Committee of the Communist Party. Its broad discussior is expected also in local organisations of the party and in its fortnightly *Comment* The draft will be the main issue on the agenda of the Party's National Congres due in November 1977.

CHILE

The struggle against fascism, and for restoration of democracy in Chile, is th main objective which should unite and mobilise the whole people. To attain tha objective the Communist Party has publicly addressed three proposals to th Christian-Democratic Party on reaching agreement between Christian-Democrat and the Popular Unity. First, the Communist Party urged the CDP to combin their effort and topple the dictatorial régime, and thereafter to give the peopl the right to make their own choice of the form of government in a democrati way. Second, the document urges the quest for a common ground with regard t the future political system. And third, it suggests that understanding be reache on the formation of a new government (after the downfall of the dictatorship comprising all democratic forces.

The Communist Party leadership has advanced these proposals inside the country, realising full well that a democratic solution of the pressing problems can be achieved in the struggle by the working class, by launching a massive movement, and with accord between the Popular Unity and the CDP.

H. F.

CONGO

President Marien Ngouabi, Chairman of the Congolese Party of Labour, signed new regulations complementing the directives on admission to the CPL. From now on a prospective CPL member will have to submit a recommendation from his factory or other place of work. The new rule will be observed under the supervision of political representatives appointed in accordance with the regulations at all state-controlled enterprises. The admission procedure now begins with a general meeting at a factory or office, which gives the applicant a testimonial for admittance. The applicant should also receive testimonials from the party organisation of his factory or office and the place of residence. This is to be followed by a meeting of political representatives who will list the candidatures in three groups: the applicant is either recommended, or rejected, or his admission is suspended. The lists are to be forwarded to the CPL Central Committee for the final decision.

DENMARK

The Communist Party submitted to Parliament a draft law on nationalisation of the country's energy sector. The nationalisation will keep the prices of oil products down and make them stable. It will also ensure uninterrupted fuel supply and guaranteed wages to workers employed in this industry.

FRANCE

More than 100,000 new members joined the Communist Party between January 1 and November 30, 1976. This is an unprecedented growth in membership in the postwar period, Paul Laurent, member of the FCP Politburo, told newsmen. His statement for the press contained the following data.

In 1973 the party was joined by 62,218 people; in 1974, by 85,378; in 1975, 93.873; and now, a month earlier than planned, 100,834 (the target for the end of the year was 100,000). This brought about a corresponding growth of the total membership of the party. It took 11 years (1961-72) to raise the membership by 30 per cent, or from 300,000 to 390,000. The figure today is 550,000—a 40 per cent growth in the past four years.

From October 18 to November 14, 390 applications for admittance were mailed to the FCP leadership. Of them, 65 per cent were from people under 30 years of age; 34 per cent were from women; 188 applications came from workers, 76 from office employees, 20 from teachers, 18 from technicians, engineers and managerial personnel, 16 from the unemployed and 44 from students.

The FCP is increasing the number of its local organisations in industry, which shot up from 3,819 in 1961 to 8,072 in 1975, and exceeded 9,000 (according to preliminary estimate) towards the end of 1976.

GUADELOUPE

The Communists of Guadeloupe demand the right to self-determination and a free choice of the way of development for their people. They come out also for new relations with France. These demands were advanced in the Central Committee report to the Sixth Congress of the Guadeloupe Communist Party in December 1976. The report, delivered by Guy Daninthe, General Secretary of the party, examined the main stages of the struggle waged by the Communists for a cardinal democratic change on the island and set the tasks for the future.

NETHERLANDS

The membership of the Communist Party keeps growing. Within the ten months of 1976 the party was joined by 1,100 workers and people from other walks of life.

NORWAY

The plenum of the Central Board of the Communist Party of Norway, held last December, discussed topical international and domestic problems, in particular, the party's tactics before the parliamentary election due in the autumn of 1977, and proposed alliance with the socialist left party during the election campaign. At a news conference after the plenum it was stressed that the CPN had grown far stronger politically, organisationally and financially over the past year.

It was decided to change the *Friheten* Communist weekly into a semi-weekly edition beginning from the autumn of 1977, which was largely due to the successful campaign, the largest ever held by the party, for raising funds for *Friheten*. More than 500,000 crowns were collected.

PERU

The exchange of party cards has been completed in the Communist Party. Presentation ceremonies have been held in all branches. The card-exchange campaign served to invigorate the activity of lower party organisations. Members of the CC Political Commission and other party functionaries spoke at meetings, informing Communists about the situation in the country, the tasks of the party at the present stage, held theoretical conferences on various aspects of Marxism-Leninism, and heard reports on the work of branches.

The card-exchange campaign, says the bulletin of the CC National Commission on Propaganda, demonstrated the unity and cohesion of party ranks and the growing level of political awareness of the Peruvian Communists. This important measure was evidence of the organisational strengthening of the Communist Party and its enhanced prestige among the working people.

SAN MARINO

The San Marino Communist Party advanced a detailed programme of renovating the country's economic, social and cultural activity, and also its foreign policy which, in its view, should be based on neutrality and co-operation with other countries. The resolution passed by the Ninth Congress of the party (December 1976) says that a new government should be formed on a broad, popular basis and include Communists according to the existing alignment of political forces in San Marino. This would be in the interest of the working people throughout the country, the resolution stressed. The congress introduced amendments in the Communist Party Rules.

VIETNAM

Following the decision of the Fourth Congress of the Working People's Party of Vietnam late last year, the party was renamed the Communist Party of Vietnam. The Communists, says the Vietnamese press, are launching a drive to implement the historic decisions of the Fourth Congress, the congress of winners and internationalists, which ushered in an era of socialist construction on the nation-wide scale. The congress summed up the results of the struggles and accomplishments over the past years and charted plans for the period ahead. Work is under way to implement the congress decisions on the main directions and targets of the 1976-80 five-year development plan. The new rules adopted at the congress provide the basis for strengthening the CPV, encouraging the initiative and efficiency of its organisations and enhancing the leading role of the party. The

targets set by the CPV have become a national programme for constructive labour and for developing socialist revolution all across the nation.

The Fourth Congress, said Le Duan, CPV General Secretary, in the Report of the Central Committee, signals the beginning of the peaceful construction of socialism. The Communists are determined to restore the country and make it much more affluent and beautiful, the way it was wanted by President Ho Chi Minh.

New Conditions—New Quality of Work

The journals of the fraternal parties of socialist countries on problems of Party building

Journals dealing with the problems of Party development hold a special place among publications in the fraternal socialist countries. The growing interest in these publications has prompted the *WMR* to interview top editors of these journals during a meeting in Varna, held on the initiative of the CC CP Bulgaria and the *Partien Zhivot* journal.

WMR staff members Yuri Mushkaterov interviewed *J. Valenta*, editor-in-chief of the journal of the CC CP Czechoslovakia *Zivot Strany* and member of the Central Auditing Commission CPCz; *J. Canela*, editor-in-chief of the journal of the Secretariat of the CC CP Cuba *El Militante Communista*; *V. Lajtai*, editor-in-chief of the CC HSWP *Partelet*; *I. Lopatynski*, editor-in-chief of the journal of the CC PUWP *Zycie Partii* and Alternate member CC PUWP; *R. Radovan*, deputy editor-in-chief of the journal of the CC CP Rumania *Munca de Partid*; *R. Rusev*, editor-in-chief of the journal of the CC BCP *Partien Zhivot*, and member of the Central Auditing Commission BCP; *M. Haldeev*, editor-in-chief of the journal of the CC CPSU *Partiinaya Zhizn*, member of the CPSU Central Auditing Commission; *Duy Tung*, editor-in-chief of the journal of the CC CP Vietnam *Hoc Tap*; *G. Chimid*, editor-in-chief of the journal of the CC MPRP *Namyn Amdral* and member of the CC MPRP; *W. Scholz*, editor-in-chief of the journal of the CC SUPG *Neuer Weg*.

RECENT congresses of Communist and Workers' parties pointed out that the fraternal countries were successfully building socialism and had entered the stage of building a developed socialist society and communism. How have the new conditions affected the content, forms and methods of party work? What problems arise in this connection and how are they dealt with in your journals?

In developed socialism, said M. Haldeev, improvement of our work is an objective necessity. This was stressed by the 25th CPSU Congress. It is of cardinal importance, therefore, to perfect the forms, methods and scientific foundations of party work. It is indicative that sociological research is helping to analyse public opinion, that a systematic and comprehensive approach, long-term planning of party work and of socio-economic development of labour collectives are being steadily introduced.

Perfection of inner-party relations is closely connected with the dynamic processes affecting all spheres of public life, with the growth of social consciousness. For example, the law-governed process of closer social division of labour, and needs arising from the concentration of production, perfecting organisation and management of the national economy have given rise to the emergence of production and scientific-production

amalgamations. This raises the question of adequate organisational forms of party work which would take account of the specific conditions of enterprises located in different regions while effectively co-ordinating party work on the amalgamation level. Practical experience has shown, as our journal helped reveal, that it was often expedient to set up a council of Party secretaries of amalgamated enterprises.

Such councils, said *W. Scholz*, are already functioning at large plants in the GDR. Our experience also suggests other organisational forms besides those we are familiar with. I have in mind the councils at enterprises and construction projects where specialists and skilled workers from other countries are employed. At the site of the Boksberg power station, for instance, the council of Party secretaries consists of the secretaries of local organisations comprising workers from the USSR, Poland, Hungary and the GDR. The council is a co-ordinating body functioning on the basis of an annsal plan which is agreed and ratified by all the party organisations.

In Mongolian conditions, said *G. Chimid*, improvement of inner-party relations is influenced by such important factors as accelerated economic development, the rapid changes in the social structure of society, the people's rising level of culture and education, and the prospects of Mongolia's socio-economic progress connected with the growing all-round co-operation of the fraternal countries, their drawing closer together and consolidation. Hence the need for greater theoretical elaboration of the new problems by the journal and systematic aid for Party activists.

Our journal has always paid close attention to analysing the experience of party organisations, helping them to improve their methods, said *P. Radovan*. Today, however, these problems are being dealt with in new conditions. The 11th Congress of the CP Rumania pointed out that at the present stage and in the future raising the Party's leading role requires that the work of Party, government and public organisations be closely interlaced. In our country some of the Party leaders stand at the head of government or economic agencies. For example, certain ministries are headed by Political Executive members of the CC CPR, while First Secretaries of provincial and city committees (in the villages these are secretaries of corresponding Party organisations) are also chairmen of committees or executive bureaus of provincial, city and village councils.

When we speak of the more exacting demands that are made today on Party journalism, *V. Lajtai* explained, we proceed mainly on the assumption that the solution of the many and intricate problems of socialist development is connected with the more mature and creative activity of Party organisations.

After the 11th HSWP Congress which gave priority to stepping up economic development, through stressing that the country's economic growth had been complicated by the unfavourable foreign market conditions, our journal was faced with many new challenging problems. It was particularly important for us to help Communists correctly interpret Party policy and understand the economic situation because at times we came up against extreme views, either underestimating existing problems and difficulties or, on the contrary, dramatising the situation. By publishing material clarifying controversial issues from Party positions, the journal helped dissipate views that did not reflect the existing situation.

It was also our duty to help Party organisations find their place in dealing with economic questions. The HSWP follows Lenin's concept that the Party and the state must perform different functions in the management of society. In dealing with production questions Party organisations should not perform the functions of the administration. Leaning on the working people's experience and initiative, they should strive to create an atmosphere for bold but competent decisions. They should not merely "rubber stamp" Party decisions, they should be a form of "political workshop" planning the programme for mobilising the masses and determining the role to be played by every Party group and every Party member. This is how we see the functioning of Party organisations. And it is the materials published in the journal which help to assert this approach.

The 15th Congress of the CPCz stressed that during the building of developed

socialism, said *J. Valenta*, much greater demands are made upon the Party itself, on its unity, the level and effect of its political, organisational and ideological work. This brings to the forefront in our journal such key tasks as helping improve the quality of Party membership, the discipline and work of Communists, broadening the democratic foundations of inner-Party life and establishing the Leninist methods of collective leadership, close ties with the masses, criticism and self-criticism and a scientific approach.

The victory over US imperialism, said *Duy Tung*, our country's reunification and the formation of the Socialist Republic of Vietnam have brought our revolution to a new stage.[1] The formation of the Socialist Republic of Vietnam is an outstanding victory of the working class and all the people of Vietnam. It is the result of the Party's correct revolutionary line, the international solidarity of the forces of socialism, national independence, democracy and world peace.

The Party's fundamental line is to lead the country rapidly and confidently towards socialism and to simultaneously carry out three revolutions: a revolution in production relations, a scientific and technological revolution and a revolution in ideology and culture, to continually intensify socialist industrialisation, build a large-scale socialist industry, maintain "collective socialist power" of the working people, and educate the new man.

As the Party's theoretical and political organ our journal invariably popularises this revolutionary line. Among the materials carried by the journal prominence is given to articles explaining Party decisions and documents, showing how these decisions are carried out, summing up positive experience and boldly revealing all shortcomings.

It is clear that the fraternal parties deal with problems that differ in magnitude and in character. How are the questions of Party building reflected in your journal?

Ours is the only specialised Party publication, said *J. Canela*. The journal is distributed free of charge through the local Party organisations and its main goal is to foster socialist consciousness among the population, broaden their political knowledge and popularise progressive methods and experience.

This, of course, is done with due account of Cuba's specific conditions, particularly the fact that even today, after several years of efforts to abolish illiteracy inherited from the former regime, the population's level of education is still not very high. This influences our work and the form in which we publish our materials. We popularise the work of grass roots organisations that have successfully established the Leninist norms and methods of work, we describe how Communists work to raise labour productivity and master new technology. We lay the stress not so much on theoretical analysis, but on concrete examples to be followed by others. The materials are written in plain language easily understood.

We take into account the specific features of socialist construction in our country, but are also guided by the need to consistently employ the principle of democratic centralism, educate the workers to be true to the interests of the working class and all the people, to Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism.

Our main goal, of course, is to bring the ideas of the Party to the broad masses. However, we think the time has come to take a broader and more analytical view of questions of Party building. This is necessary, mainly, because, as Fidel Castro said at the Party's First Congress, there had been confusion in understanding the functions of the Party and the state: substituting Party with state and economic functions did not help other public organisations grow stronger and increase their influence. One of our main tasks is to popularise the principle and work of the peoples' organs of power and the ways and means of exercising their Party guidance.

The questions of Party and state construction, said *Duy Tung*, are very important to Vietnam today. We show that it is necessary to strictly observe the principles of democratic centralism, maintain close ties between Party development and formation of the state machinery, constantly improving the effectiveness of Party organisations, cadres and the membership.

Commenting on fulfilment of the principle of democratic centralism, *M. Haldeev* pointed out that its continued development is characteristic of the present stage. Our Party believes it important to promote inner-Party democracy. For example extended Party committees have been set up at large enterprises, with more than half the members workers. There are no instructions from above on Committee membership, this is decided by Communists themselves at annual election meetings. This, undoubtedly, improves ties with the masses and helps in dealing with requests and proposals.

According to the SUPG Rules, founded on democratic centralism, said *W. Scholz*, the primary organisations are the Party's foundation and that is why our greatest attention is turned to this most important element of the SUPG's organisational structure. Interesting in this respect is the work of public commissions in the primary organisation. They impart concrete content to the principle of collective leadership because ever more Communists are involved in the many aspects of Party work, making broad use of these rights and extending tangible aid to organisations in making political decisions.

Another example is personal meetings between the Party leadership and Communists during which they discuss a wide range of questions of working and living conditions. Some of these may be brought up at a Party meeting where the Party leadership reports on what steps have been taken in response to criticism and proposals made by members. This practice was further developed after the SUPG Central Committee resolution that factory managers must regularly inform Party bodies on steps taken in connection with proposals and criticism by the working people.

It is very important that there be close ties between the Party and the masses and between the Party leadership and the membership, said *I. Lopatynski*. This deepens inner-Party democracy, making Party organisation more active.

A while ago the PUWP CC Politbureau decided to establish direct ties with Party organisation in 165 large industrial enterprises. These meetings and talks beween the factory Party secretaries and the Party leadership are, undoubtedly, of mutual interest.

For the Party such meetings play a dual role, for it not only becomes better acquainted with public opinion, but during discussions of vital issues Party organisations set their sights on dealing with timely problems on a national scale. At recent meetings, for example, we discussed Party enrolment, the reserve of our industry, and, most recently, improvement of ideological and political education among the population. Such meetings are regularly reported by our journal in articles by secretaries of Party committees, interviews, etc.

Despite the difference in proportion of workers in the fraternal parties due to the heterogeneous social structure of the population in individual socialist countries and the criteria determining working class affiliation, the general tendency, judging by Congress materials, is that this proportion is increasing. What are some of the problems your journal has to deal with in connection with this?

Among the more important materials in our journals, said *V. Laitai* and *G. Chimid*, are articles dealing with such subjects as quality of the Party membership, Marxist-Leninist education of Communists, consolidating the Party's worker core, registering changes in the social structure, education and cultural level of society. They pointed out the necessity of forming traits of character in new Party members, similar to those that were formed in the characters of older members in the struggle with the class enemy. In Cuba, added *J. Canela*, this form of education is very important because of the Party's rapid growth and also because many Cuban Communists are revolutionaries who acquired a Marxist-Leninist education in the process of furthering the revolution.

On the question of Party enrolment, said *Duy Tung*, the journal advises the primary organisations to pay more attention to quality, so that only the best and most conscious join the Party while the Party rids itself of opportunist, career-seeking, declassed elements.

We do not question the journal's important role, in helping to form the Party's social composition, said *J. Valenta*. As a matter of fact, this is one of the main directions in our

work. In line with the instructions of the 14th CPCz Congress, the Party was able to overcome in the last five years the mistakes made in enrolment and restore the Leninist principles of Party recruiting. Approximately 334 thousand candidate members joined the Party in this period and, what is also important, for the first time in over 20 years the share of workers again started to increase comprising more than 62 per cent of the new members with more than half under 25 years of age. Our main task today is to continue this rate started after the 14th Congress, step up the education of new members, avoid a mechanical approach to the question of membership through careful and individual selection and strengthen the Party's influence by increasing membership in key branches of industry.

Besides recruiting more workers said *I. Lopatynski*, we are also interested in seeing more professionals and farmers join. Our Party is working to greatly increase agricultural production and for a gradual transformation of the villages along socialist lines. This difficult task requires not only material resources, but also a high level of consciousness and culture and increasing the number of peasants in the Party, for the most conscious peasants are the vehicles of Party policy in the rural areas. Today tte most influential and effective Party organisations are in the state and co-operative farms. But we also have almost a million small, individual peasant farms whose owners work on construction sites or in factories. These are peasant-workers. Party members among them are registered in their organisations at place of work and not in the village. And then many of the rural Communists joined the Party during World War II or during the first days of people's power. Many were not able to complete their education. Regretfully, Party membership among the rest of the peasants is not very high so it is clear that we face a big job that will take some time. In this systematic and purposeful work we are counting mainly on the conscious part of the rural youth.

What do you think is the best way of improving the journals' style and methods of work?

Well, first of all, said *P. Rusev*, by helping Party workers to assimilate scientific methods of leadership, to see and understand the theory of the concrete experience of Party organisations, the journal has broadened its connections with research establishments with the Party Building Centre of the Bulgarian Academy of Social Sciences, the Social Department of the CC BCP and the institutes of the Bulgarian Academy of Sciences. Simultaneously we want to raise the journal's role as organiser. Before, our view of experimentation was erroneous, but experience has shown that in Party work also, scientific methods are possible, including systems analysis and special-purpose programming. It is particularly important to follow the Leninist principles of Party building, Party standards, to avoid theory from becoming scholastic, isolated from practice and concrete experience.

Supported by the CC we are involved in and are even initiators of several experiments. For instance, the journal helped draw up a special-purpose programme on the basis of an experiment in the city of Plovdiv, to raise the role of the primary Party organisations. In Varna, with the district Party committee's scientific council (it includes scientists and Party functionaries), a theoretical conference on further developing inner-Party democracy will be held. We believe this type of work provides the journal with the opportunity of analysing and reacting timely to pressing problems of the day.

Our journal, said *M. Haldeev*, has started publication of a series of articles which, we hope, will help Party workers acquire a systematised knowledge of modern aspects of the theory of Party building, ideological work, social psychology and pedagogics. Of course, for this the journal had to strengthen its ties with such research institutions as the Marxism-Leninism Institute, the Academy of Social Sciences and CC CPSU Higher Party School. We also started refresher programmes for our staff journalists. In the past two years all our younger staff have completed a course on Party building at the Higher Party Correspondence School of the CC CPSU, twelve others attended refresher courses at the Institute for Party and Administrative Executives. Another effective form of study are meetings with Party and government leaders in the journal's offices, visits to various

enterprises in and around Moscow to study the work of their Party organisations.

The topic of organisational work of the journals is prominent in the interviews. *Duy Tung* spoke of perfecting a rapid system of information to keep in close touch with local conditions; *G. Chimid* spoke of the round table discussions with departments at the CC MPRP on such subjects as the scientific foundation of Party work and planning. *J. Canela* noted the special importance of meeting on a regular basis with secretaries of Party organisations.

Concrete sociological research, said *P. Radovan*, is a great help to the journal, and we try to make the best use of the results and conclusions. And, presuming that broad dissemination of sociological methods accords with a natural desire to improve scientific methods in Party work, we also published a series of articles and a book describing the technique of such research.

In Czechoslovakia, said *J. Valenta*, we have no specialised Party publications on the work of lecturers, propagandists, to be used in Party education or for agitators. In this respect ours is a universal journal and must serve the entire Party *aktiv*—whether in the organisational or the ideological sphere. For this reason we try to simultaneously carry documentary materials and articles describing the work of Party organisations providing them with practical help, and articles on Marxism-Leninism to be used by our propagandists and agitators. We shall continue working for the optimal balance between the different material we publish and improving the journal's make-up, and this, we think, is also in the reader's interest.

Our journal lays much stress on the work of Communist and Workers' parties, particularly the CPSU and the fraternal parties of the socialist community. We inform our readers of cardinal events in the course of their activities, their experience in party work, the theory and practice of party building. Popular among our subscribers are articles on the international Communist and workers' movement, on the topical issues concerning the implementation of proletarian internationalism in revolutionary practice.

Comprehensive, long-term planning by the journal covering the period between congresses was described by *G. Chimid*. This helps focus attention on the more pressing questions posed by the Party and to systematise our publications.

P. Rusev added that his journal prefers special-purpose planning allowing for not more than 10-12 main topics a year. These are elaborated by special groups co-operating with research institutions and Party organisations.

Writing on the problems of Party life today, it was agreed, requires that the editorial staff untiringly perfect its work and competently apply the Marxist-Leninist method of analysis in order to better resolve the problems posed by the fraternal parties today.

---

[1]Duy Tung was interviewed prior to the 4th Congress of the CP Vietnam.—*ED*.

The Voice of Truth

ANTONIO DIAS LOURENCO
Political Commission Member, CC Portuguese Communist Party, and Editor-in-Chief, *Avante*

THE Eighth Congress of the Portuguese Communist Party summed up the gains of the popular movement and the Party's activities over the past years. Those were trying years of stuggle by the workers and other working people, by progressive civilians and servicemen, a struggle to whose record the Communists added many an example of heroism, loyalty to their people and boundless devotion to freedom, democracy and a socialist future.

The congress pointed out the big role of *Avante*, the Communist Party's national daily, in this struggle. The paper came out illegally throughout four grim decades of fascist rule. The working people, its only "censor", trusted it as a paper that helped them in their everyday fight against poverty, fascist oppression and exploitation.

Many of our comrades gaves their lives as heroes in bringing out and circulating *Avante*. Among them were Jose Moreira, killed by PIDE butchers, Maria Machado, who died in a fascist prison, and Joaquim Rafael, whose health was fatally shattered by twenty years of work as an underground printer.

The PCP daily has always been an embodiment of the militancy and sense of responsibility that are so typical of the Party. And these qualities remained after April 25, 1974. Ever since it emerged from illegality, it has sought a place in the revolutionary process befitting its militant traditions, which developed in close connection with the progress of the Party's political, ideological, information and propaganda activity.

The paper is operating in highly complicated conditions. Counter-revolutionaries, exploiting the slogan of "pluralism", use the press as an effective tool. Many reactionary publications financed and published by those who after April 25 lost political power spread misinformation, lies and calumnies to mislead the people. Reaction takes advantage of freedom of the press, established by the new Constitution, to undermine the foundations of democracy, in particular by assailing the Constitution. Moreover, government control of certain newspapers and other mass media amounts, in effect, to a monopoly of the ruling party on the familiar plea of "pluralism".

In these circumstances, *Avante* sees its task in carrying on explanatory work, exposing reactionary intrigues and discussing the more urgent problems of Portuguese reality· agitating the broadest social strata and not the working classes alone. The paper strives in any situation to speak authoritatively for the Party, propound its policy line and indicate "the exact direction of the struggle of the working class and the masses in the advancing revolutionary process", as Alvaro Cunhal put it in his congress report.

A militant mass newspaper is, naturally, a powerful weapon of the working class in difficult conditions in which the revolution is following a zigzag course and it is imperative to expose counter-revolutionary manoeuvres and conspiracies, resist ultra-leftist adventurism and provocation, show up the opportunism of Social Democratic leaders and defend civil freedoms and other fundamental gains of the revolution.

In upholding internationalism, spreading the truth about the socialist countries' achievements and innovating experience, laying bare the imperialist policy of aggression, calling for solidarity with the victims of fascist repression and imperialist expansion and commenting on international events, *Avante* both supplies its readers with objective information on what goes on in the world and educates them in an internationalist spirit.

In 1976, *Avante* had an average circulation of 99,800. In assessing this figure, it is essential to take account of the overall state of the Portuguese press and today's political situation, in which the national daily of a party holding 40 seats in parliament cannot be legally distributed in some areas of the country because they are still dominated by fascist

elements. But all difficulties notwithstanding, the circulation of *Avante* could be a steady 100,000.

To do this, we must restructure the paper, enrich its content and improve editorial work. On the political plane, we must raise the level of information, agitation and propaganda. We plan therefore to carry more commentaries on current events, give more space to the experience of the revolutionary movement, analyse ideological problems more deeply, carry more information and improve its quality. We feel that all this would enable *Avante* to live up to its role as the Party's national daily. In dealing with problems raised by life, we must improve presentation and show greater variety and imagination, which, incidentally, are typical of our Party's working methods.

We are now enlarging the editorial staff, establishing closer links with Party organisations and CC departments and more efficiently co-ordinating the efforts of the paper and other Party information and propaganda media. The problem of selecting correspondents is one of the most pressing and can only be solved jointly by the editors and Party organisations.

Much has yet to be done to increase our readership. *Avante* reaches some Party organisations and factories at irregular intervals. In some cases, this is due to subversion and so we must promptly detect and expose those behind it. But there are also cases of Party organisations underestimating the importance of circulating the paper. This means that we must continue doing everything for the prompt circulation of the paper through Party organisations. Of course, we do not for a moment forget that this method limits to a degree both circulation and the Party's influence among the masses. We therefore regard it as a pressing task to extend the commercial distribution network of *Avante*. The Party's voice must be heard everywhere.

In 1976 *Avante*, drawing on the enthusiasm and support of the whole Party, held its first festival. The festival took place in an atmosphere of brotherhood and solidarity and had widespread repercussions at home and abroad. Hundreds of thousands of Portuguese and numerous foreign guests hailed it. It drew participants from the newspapers of fraternal parties and hundreds of prominent art workers of Portugal and other countries, and was evidence of the organising capacity and influence of the PCP and of the Communists' close links with the creative forces of the nation.

Avante, which enjoys the whole Party's support and has gained ample experience in decades of underground struggle and years of activity as a legal publication, is striving to become a mass daily worthy of the finest traditions of the Communist press.

International Conference in Sofia

"THEORETICAL and Practical Problems of Social Development in Materials of Congresses of the Fraternal Parties of Socialist Countries" was the theme of an international conference of Party officials and scholars held in December 1976 in Sofia and attended by delegations of the Communist and Workers' parties of Bulgaria, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, the GDR, Hungary, Mongolia, Poland, Rumania, the Soviet Union, and a *WMR* delegation.

Papers at the plenary session were presented by A. Lilov, Politbureau member and secretary of the CC BCP; Academician A. G. Yegorov, CC member, CPSU, director of the CC CPSU Institute of Marxism-Leninism; R. Polanco, first deputy head of the International Relations Department, CC CP of Cuba; V. Beida, alternate CC member, CP of Czechoslovakia, head of the Propaganda and Agitation Department, CC CPCz; H. Hornig, CC member, SUPG, head of the Science Department, CC SUPG; S. Lakos, CC member, HSWP, director of the Hungarian Institute of Social Sciences; T. Balhazhav, CC member, MPRP, head of the Ideological Department, CC MPRP; W. Klimczak,

alternate CC member, PUWP, head of the Department of Ideological and Educational Work, CC PUWP; C. Matei, alternate CC member, RCP, deputy head of the Propaganda Department, CC RCP; K. I. Zarodov, alternate CC member, CPSU, Editor-in-Chief of *World Marxist Review*.

The three conference panels discussed: "Laws Governing the Construction of a Developed Socialist Society and Communism", "Developing the Socialist Community at the Present Stage", "Peaceful Coexistence, the World Revolutionary Process and the Ideological Struggle". Papers were read by members of the *WMR* delegation.

All in all, nearly 90 persons presented papers or spoke in the debate.

Pages from the Book of Courage

The Quiet Heroism of the Revolutionary

COMRADE Rodney Arismendi, First Secretary of our Party, once said:

"We are not a sect or a group of conspirators. We are born of the working class and the people and are therefore ordinary human beings, simple and modest. We like bread and wine, the joys of life, women and children, peace and friendship the guitar and songs, the stars and flowers; we are not embittered men and are not out to undermine existing customs, nor to press life into a narrow phraseological framework, as in the days of old Chinese women were made to press their feet into tiny shoes.

"Our teacher, Karl Marx, was fond of repeating the words of Terentius, 'nothing human is alien to me'. That is why the great Lenin, our teacher, is so near to us. He was the most human of humans; he liked Beethoven's Appassionata, but firmly steered the ship of the revolution and was irreconcilable to its enemies.

"That explains why we respect the quiet heroism that is part of day-to-day revolutionary activity, and we are undaunted by the knowledge that it might entail torture, bullets, even death itself."

These words, inscribed on our Party cards, are always with the Uruguayan Communists, who combine work in the factory, the field, the artist's studio or the university classroom with the "quiet heroism of day-to-day revolutionary activity".

Hour of Ordeal

Time was when our small country was known as the Switzerland of Latin America — it had the continent's most liberal constitution. Today, no description of Uruguay can avoid such words as "catastrophe", "decline", "neglect" and "terror". Uruguay now has one of the continent's most repressive regimes and the world's highest number of political detainees in proportion to the population.

The prisoners are crowded in anchored ships, old railway carriages, the capital's stadium, even former cold-storage warehouses. Thousands are being kept in prisons, army barracks and former trade union offices converted into torture chambers. The fascist dictatorship is wreaking its vengence on public, political and trade union leaders, workers, actors, singers, school teachers, students, patriotically-minded servicemen, including General Liber Seregni, the popular chairman of the Broad Front, and several of his colleagues.

Hundreds have gone through The Hell, the torture centre the regime set up in October 1975 at the barracks of the 13th Motorised Infantray Battalion. Men and women are herded together and kept in inhuman conditions. Torture has brought some to the edge of insanity, even death. But not a single one of these true anti-fascists betrayed his comrades in the illegal organisation fighting the tyrannical regime.

Caught in the throes of an internal crisis, the dictatorship is using savage repression in an attempt to paralyse the people's will to fight. The most savage repressions are directed at the Communist Party.

"Don Juan Maria Bordaberry[1]
President, Republica Oriental del Uruguay.

Mr. President,

My son, Alvaro Balbi, was arrested on Tuesday, July 29. He is 31, a Uruguayan, married, the father of four small children, and an honest worker... On the afternoon of Thursday, July 31, your officials notified his wife and my wife, his mother, that he had died at 1 am of an attack of asthma caused by a cold, and that we could take possession of his body at the Armed Forces Hospital....

"The authorities arrested a man in the flower of life, but, in the hands of his jailors, he lived little more than 24 hours... The doctors who treated him for the usual illnesses can confirm that, though he had no strong constitution, he was healthy and in excellent condition. He never suffered from asthma or any other chronic ailment. He was an energetic, active and life-loving person... He graduated from the National Conservatory where he studied the piano, but also played the violin, the guitar and other instruments... He composed music, but under the present system his development as a composer was stunted. He had a big family and was poor.

"... When I came to the hospital to collect his belongings I was given his marriage ring, underwear, a woollen sweater, a suit, coat and winter shoes. How could he have caught cold? Is it believable that a young, strong and absolutely healthy man could die of a cold? Was he tortured, Mr. President? Why were his clothes smeared with dirt? Why was his head bandaged?..."

Behind these sad and dignified lines written by school teacher Selmar Balbi is the tragedy of our people, whom the dictatorship is depriving of its finest and most talented sons.

The following are only a few of the 6,000 now languishing in prison and subjected to torture: Communist Party leaders Jaime Perez, Jose Luis Massera, Alberto Altesor, Jorge Mazzarovich, Luis Touron, Rita Ibarburu, Eduardo Bleier; trade union leaders Wladimir Turianski, Gerardo Cuesta, Rosario Pietraroia, all of them also Party functionaries. The list includes many many more heroes whose names have become symbolic of our people's struggle.

Jose Luis Massera, Secretary of our Party Central Committee is a world-renowned scientist, brilliant mathematician, in whom are harmoniously blended the qualities of researcher, teacher and political leader. He was active in the solidarity campaign with Republican Spain and the Soviet Union, which bore the brunt of the war against fascism, was one of the founders of the World Peace Council, is respected in Uruguay as a humanist and as a man of wide culture. Months of inhuman torture have left him with dislocation of the pelvic bones. His wife, Marta Valentini, a Party member, is in prison and subjected to torture.

Towards the end of last year Massera was transferred to a small airless cell with practically no daylight. His glasses were taken away, and he is not allowed to continue his scientific studies he carried on even in the most difficult conditions. According to available information, he is accused of having organised a "demonstration" in prison: he sang the national anthem on the 56th anniversary of the Communist Party of Uruguay.

Another member of the Party Executive, Alberto Altesor, a popular railwaymen's leader and member of Parliament, was thrown into prison though he had just had a very difficult heart operation. For 53 days in succession he was tortured in The Hell and for many months he was kept blind-folded.

The only crime of these and other prisoners is that they had fought for democracy, national sovereignty and human dignity.

The dictatorship could not jail the writer Francisco Espinola — he died on June 27, 1973, the day of the coup — but it has done everything to besmirch the memory of a man who is the pride of Uruguayan culture.

He was one of our most popular writers, and people called him Paco (short for Francisco). He belonged to a Blanco family.[2] In August 1971 he was presented with the red card of a Communist Party member.

In accepting the Party card, Espinola spoke with emotion of what had led him to join a Party whose ideology was contrary to all the principles he had been taught from childhood. And he replied to those who had slandered him, to all the charges of preaching hatred and disrespect for national traditions.

"... For many years I have had a close friendship with Communists; close because it was forged in difficult struggle... At first I admired only individuals, but gradually I came to understand that my Communist friends, though differing in character, social and material status and cultural level, in every situation acted with dignity and courage. Since then I have had a deep feeling of respect for a Party which, because of its unity and cohesion, has been able to survive in the most trying circumstances."

There can be little doubt that if he were alive Espinola would have spoken with the same conviction of his deep respect for the courage and devotion of the Communists. These qualities are now being put to the test, tempered and strengthened in the day-to-day underground struggle.

"Ungovernable Uruguayans"

Every day, without high-sounding phrases, patiently and persistently, the Communists continue the fight against the dictatorship. And in this fight they are carrying on Uruguay's liberation traditions, the cause of Jose Artigas, the 19th century revolutionary who led our people to independence. The oligarchy, which Artigas said consisted of "bad foreigners and the worst Americans", denounced him as a criminal for his patriotism and revolutionary spirit. Today the people and the core of the nation, the workers, have taken up his motto: "I shall never sell the rich heritage of Uruguay for the cheap price of poverty".

The dictatorship hates Artigas and is extolling Latorre, a 19th century despot. But it ought to be reminded that at the close of the last century the people drove out Latorre. He once complained that the Uruguayans were an "ungovernable nation". They are "ungovernable" today, too, but only for those who have plunged the country into economic catastrophe and social calamity, are working hand in glove with the Chilean fascists, take their cue from the Brazilian gorillas, are building up an alliance with the racists of South Africa...

Alvaro Balbi's comrades distributed leaflets in Montevideo exposing those responsible for his death. The size of cinema tickets, such mini-leaflets, bearing the Party's hammer-and-sickle emblem, regularly distributed or simply scattered on the streets — at great risk of course — are a sure sign that the Communist Party is alive and fighting. Another sign is the "wall-poster war" — young underground workers paint slogans and demands for the release of all political prisoners on house-walls. In this and other ways the regime is always made to feel the resistance of the people, led by the Communist Party.

In a statement on the coup that overthrew Bordaberry the Party declared:

"For three years, in the teeth of cruel terror, the people's resistance found expression in the strikes called by the trade unions, the defeat of pro-government candidates in the 1973 university elections, the student protests, the 70,000 signatures in support of higher wages in 1975, and in the May Day demonstrations that came as a challenge to the government's policy of oppression..."

The dictatorship failed in its repeated attempts to establish docile trade unions and, of course, has not dared to permit genuine unions. But the factory committees of the National Workers' Convention continue to operate underground. Illegal meetings of workers, students and teachers are no rarity. The Communists are the soul of the

resistance movement and spare no effort to unite all honest Uruguayans, civilians and servicemen alike, in an anti-dictatorship front.

The regime has not been able to destroy the Communist Party. Driven into clandestinity, it has retained and continues to build its ranks. It publishes an illegal newspaper *Carta Semanal* and other Party literature.

Dedication and courage have won the Communists wide respect and admiration. For in them the people see men and women who really love their country, unlike those who are prepared to sell it to foreign capital; men and women devoted to the ideas of freedom and democracy, unlike those for whom freedom means freedom to exploit the people; patriots and internationalists, for precisely because the Communists are internationalists they are staunch patriots.

The very word "revolutionary" has acquired a much wider meaning since the October Revolution. Cesar Reyes Daglio, a Party Executive Committee member, once remarked. That is nothing new, but it is worth repeating. For us Uruguayan Communists, being a revolutionary means continuing the cause begun by the Party of Lenin in October 1917. And what was valid 60 years ago is just as valid today.

We Uruguayan Communists do not hesitate to proclaim our internationalism, though the enemy uses this to accuse us of betraying national interests and subjects our Party to continous repression. We see our patriotic duty in persistently working to create the best conditions for the national and social liberation of our people. And we know that the attainment of that goal largely depends on the world revolutionary process and on closer unity of all the anti-fascist forces.

Uruguayan Communists often pay with their lives for their love of country and their fidelity to the principles of proletarian internationalism.

Stronger Than Death

Nibia Sabalsagaray loved life and rejoiced in its manifestations. People were attracted by her sincerity and revolutionary fervour. But life wasn't easy. Born into a poor working-class family, she managed to graduate from the Lyceum and then the Motevideo Teachers' College. She was invited to teach there and it was at that time that she made her first steps in literature.

Reading Lenin helped her find her place in the ranks of the fighters for freedom and social justice, and it was not long before she brought many of her friends into the movement.

She was only 24, about to be married and begin a new career, in medicine, when she died in jail from "dry submarine" torture — her head was placed in a plastic bag, the ends securely tied around her neck, but this, too, could not make her talk.

Communist women prisoners set an inspiring example of revolutionary integrity and stamina. Rita Ibarburu, a member of the Party Central Committee, won the love and admiration of her comrades. One day, the authorities ordered another Communist leader, Eduardo Bleier, to be buried alive. Rita heard his cries, called other prisoners and managed to save his life. During even the worst torture sessions she found the strength to sing. They were songs of the struggle.

And this from a letter smuggled out of prison: "There were about 100 of us in the barrack, men and women, all naked and manacled, standing in rows almost body to body. Those who could no longer stand on their feet lay on the floor.

"I could not move after the repeated torture. Blood caked in my mouth, my throat was dry. I could not cast off the scenes of horror — in my mind's eye I could see people falling to the ground, only to be put on their feet again and have red hot electric-charged nails applied to the sensitive parts of the body. I had a feeling of sliding into a huge pit and making a desperate effort to hold on, breathe. . . How long did it last, hours, days? And then a voice rang out. I knew it was the voice of Rita. She sang folk songs we all knew. I could not see her, because all of us wore dark hoods. But I knew it was Rita. Her name was being repeated by everyone in that horrible barrack, and the night did not seem so dark."

And also this letter from a prisoner to his mother:

"Can one live through all this? Now more than ever before I know that I can withstand any amount of imprisonment and physical pain. For one has a reserve of moral strength which one can draw upon when things become desperate.

"When you remain honest and consistent in your principles and in your attitude to others, when your conscience does not trouble you, you can withstand every ordeal.

"I never lose hope. And my hope is not the kind that comes from irresponsibility or adventurism. No, it is born of friendship with people, with all their virtues and weaknesses. A strong person cannot be reduced to an inhuman state; no one can destroy his feeling of collectivism. That has always been so. As for myself . . . things might have been much worse, some incurable illness, say. Seek solace in that and reassure the rest of the family. Do not torment each other. And most important, do not lose hope, remain and fight together. Cry, tears will ease your sorrow, but don't worry. You are my mother, my best friend and comrade. You fought for all of us, you made sacrifices for us. You have no reason to be ashamed. You should not feel pity or shame. Wait patiently and fight. We will never let you down."

A son urges his mother, his friends and relatives not to lose heart. He knows how much courage it takes to get even a tiny bit of information from the authorities, face threats and insults, cope with all the sorrow and hardships. But they must never lose hope. In its message to relatives of political detainees, the Party Central Committee Executive expressed its respect and gratitude for their courage and heroism, their contribution to the solidarity movement with the victims of terror and to the struggle against the dictatorship.

The anti-dictatorship front is everywhere, in every corner of the country.

Son of the People

Communist Party Secretary Jaime Perez was arrested on October 24, 1974. For over a year he had been working underground. He was acting Party leader after the arrest of Rodney Arismendi.

A tall, well-built and strong man, he celebrated his 47th birthday in the Punta Cavretas prison, to which he was confined in February 1975. Prison undermined his health: torture affects even the strongest. Fellow prisoners said he was always attentive, could be relied upon for help and encouragement. "Hold on," he would tell his comrades, "hold on, the fascist regime will not last forever. . ."

Life has not been kind to Perez. He had to leave school before he was 16 and, like many other Uruguayans, begin earning a living. In 1954, already a seasoned trade union leader, Perez became a member of the Party Central Committee and at the 16th Party Congress was elected to the CC Executive and Secretary of the Party organisation in Montevideo, the country's biggest industrial centre. He was then only 26.

Jaime Perez is known, personally or by name, to practically every worker in Montevideo. He visited all its factories, consistently upheld the workers' interests in the municipal council and in Parliament, to which he was elected on the Broad Front ticket — he represented the Communist Party in that left coalition.

Like many others, I admired the humaneness of his approach, his ability to understand the masses and to be understood by them.

In 1972 fascist thugs fired on and killed a group of Communist workers in Montevideo. Addressing a public meeting on the first anniversary of their death, Jaime Perez told the audience: "These eight workers will always remain in our hearts, like all Uruguayan Communists and YCLers who gave their lives in the sacred cause of liberating our people. They are a shining beacon illuminating to all democrats and patriots the road ahead. Their cause has been taken up by everyone who wants to see a new society built in Uruguay, a society of bread and roses, of peace and labour."

Jaime Perez found apt and eloquent words to describe these fallen heroes. What he did not say, however, was that it was only by accident that he escaped that night. Nor was this the first attempt on his life. In January 1961 he was seriously wounded during a bandit raid

on the Party headquarters and survived only thanks to his strong constitution.

In February 1976 Jaime Perez was transferred from the Punta Carretas prison. For six months he had been subjected to incredibly brutal torture. Throughout all this time he wore a dark hood over his head and every now and again was hanged by his hands tied at his back. He spent two months in complete isolation and was allowed to lie down only at night. His fingers became numb.

Comrade Perez was given a second sentence while serving the first. Then he disappeared. There is reason to believe that he is being kept in an army unit directly subordinate to the ground forces command, and this time is being tortured by agents of the "information service".

The illegal YCL paper *Liber Arce* (named for a patriot killed in 1968) wrote of Jaime Perez: "The physical and psychological torture defies imagination. The fascists were determined to break him, but they did not reckon with his will-power and heroism. Hailed before the tribunal, Jaime exposed his torturers, though he knew this would mean more repression. In Jaime we have a sterling example of an irreconcilable attitude to fascism."

Death has torn many comrades from our ranks. Their memory lives among the people, multiplying the forces fighting the dictatorship. No amount of torture can break the will of Communists or compel them to renounce their convictions.

In an appeal to its members and the people, the Party declared:

"There is no destroying the Communist Party and the Young Communist League... For we are an inalienable part of our country. We are deeply rooted in the masses; our strong and healthy roots go to the very core of the monolithic Uruguayan working class. Our strength has been built up by the persistent and patient work of generations of Communists and at the cost of countless sacrifices...

"Whom the gods would destroy they first make mad, the ancient saying goes. Today's reactionaries are mad. For they cannot appreciate the sources of our strength. But every Communist knows that despite the vicissitudes of his own life, the months and years in prison, the terrible hours of torture, and despite death itself, his life as a fighter continues in the efforts of others, in the struggle for the victory of the working class and the people, a cause to which he had given his life. And if we keep faith with this cause, prison, torture, death, will not daunt us.

"Every Communist who has gone through the Ordeals of the struggle, no matter how modest his contribution, will be remembered in history as the necessary yeast of the happy bread of our tomorrow."

With quiet and modest heroism, the Uruguayan Communists continue their "day-to-day revolutionary work" to hasten the advent of that future.

Ricardo Saxlund
Uruguayan publicist

---

[1]Bordaberry was deposed on June 29, 1966 in a military coup and replaced by an equally hated tyrant, Aparicio Mendes, who makes no secret of his admiration of the Brazilian model of fascism.

[2]Blanco and Colorado, traditional bourgeois parties.

Rust-Proof Weapon of the Working Class

MICHAEL O'RIORDAN
General Secretary, Communist Party of Ireland

PROBLEMS of international co-operation and solidarity of the forces of peace, democracy and social progress have lately gained in importance. Nor is this accidental. Daily experience shows us how very "small" the world has become and how greatly the life of nations depends on international development trends. We are living at a time when many human activities have become highly internationalised. All this leaves a deep social and political imprint on the world of the last quarter of the twentieth century.

The public activity of mankind is becoming internationalised in the atmosphere of an unabating class contest. This contest, too, has shifted into the international arena as a struggle between the two opposed social systems and as a development of the central contradiction of the epoch, which is the content of the world-wide transition from capitalism to socialism.

In this situation, the specific manifestations of the internationalisation of economic and political life objectively assume a class complexion and trend. There are, for example, the integrational processes taking place in the capitalist and socialist economies and differing thoroughly in class substance. Naturally, the subjective reflection of this most important trend of today's world in the political practice of capitalism and socialism, of the bourgeoisie and the working class, is likewise different.

The strategy of imperialism, of monopoly capital, banks heavily on the greatest possible pooling of all available military, economic and political resources.

In looking back at recent history, it is worth recalling that Hitler fascism devoted its efforts to unifying world reaction under anti-communist slogans. After the war, the role of unifier of all opponents of peace, social progress and national liberation was assumed by US imperialism. The aggressive NATO bloc, which is directed against socialism and, furthermore, intended to perform police functions in regard to revolutionary democrats in capitalist countries; the European Economic Community, whose ideologues try to make the peoples of Western Europe renounce national statehood and sovereignty; and innumerable other broad and narrow alliances of countries and monopolies, formed to evolve a common policy against socialism, against the working-class and national liberation movement, are realities of the international solidarity of the bourgeoisie.

It goes without saying that the forces opposed to the imperialist diktat and championing the national freedom of peoples and the social emancipation of all working men neither can be, nor are, indifferent to the internationalisation processes objectively going on in public life or to the monopoly bourgeoisie's attempts to rally together. Analysis of key trends and changes in the world situation has led the international Communist movement to the conclusion that the movement must raise its unity "to a higher level in conformity with present-day requirements."[1] Having stated this, the 1969 world Communist forum stressed that it was the road to closer unity of the movement in furthering relations between fraternal parties "on the principles of proletarian internationalism, solidarity, and mutual support, respect for independence and equality, and non-interference in each other's internal affairs."[2]

The idea of proletarian internationalism and the principles of political strategy determined by it are expressive of the fundamental common interests of all contingents of the international working class and their solidarity in the face of a class enemy seeking unity. The essence and objective basis of proletarian internationalism were defined by

Frederick Engels. "As the condition of the working class of all countries is identical and as their interests are identical and their enemies the same," he said, "they must fight in common and pose the fraternal alliance of the workers of all nations against the fraternal alliance of the bourgeoisie of all nations."

Proletarian internationalism has been inseparable from the revolutionary struggle of the working class throughout its history. We Irish Communists have all the more reason to say so because representatives of our revolutionary working class were active in the First International as one of its national sections. One of the early movements launched by Marx and Engels on the principles of proletarian internationalism was the movement of solidarity with the freedom fighters of Ireland jailed after the defeat of the 1857 rising.

On the other hand, the experience of our people's struggle for freedom contributed to Marxist revolutionary theory. It is well known that Marx and Engels followed the Irish national movement with keen attention. In estimating its gains and setbacks, the founders of scientific communism specified and carried forward the concept of proletarian internationalism. In particular, it was analysis of the Irish experience that provided the basis for their highly important conclusion that a nation which oppresses other nations cannot itself be free, and for the more specific conclusion—one that was also most profound theoretically—that the British working class could not win its social emancipation until it broke with the policy of the British ruling classes towards Ireland.

In recalling these facts of the past and stressing the deep-lying historical roots of the concept of proletarian internationalism, we certainly do not wish to create the impression that the entire theory and practice of international working-class solidarity can be mechanically transplanted in their original form from the nineteenth century into the last quarter of the twentieth. Indeed, the world has undergone tremendous changes in this period and many new elements have been added to both the content and the forms of proletarian internationalism.

For almost six decades now, socialism has existed as both a scientific theory and a social reality. Moreover, since the October Revolution, other socialist revolutions have triumphed in Europe, Asia and Latin America. This has created the basis for fostering proletarian internationalism at a time when the working class has risen to a higher plane in its struggle, to the stature of holder of state power, to the position of ruling class. As a result, proletarian internationalism within the socialist community has acquired an unprecedentedly rich content in the form of all-round fraternal co-operation among nations united by a common social system.

Besides, within the framework of international unity of the working class, proletarian internationalism now has a material basis it never had before—existing socialism. Today the revolutionary working-class movement is in a position to lean on so mighty a force as the world prestige and influence of the Soviet Union and the socialist community as a whole.

This is one of the far-reaching changes in the world that adds to the content of the concept of proletarian internationalism and conditions policies flowing from its principles. Another change of great moment in this respect is, undoubtedly, the high degree of maturity reached by the revolutionary working-class movement and the Communist parties. The vast experience of political and ideological struggle gained by them has become a reliable basis for their independent approach to the solution of the most challenging problems posed by both distinctive national situations and changes on the international scene.

Hence the logical solution of the problem of the organisational forms of international co-operation among brother parties. It is no longer necessary, as in the days of the First International and the Comintern, to institutionalise international working-class unity, nor does our movement need a leading centre any more. The Communist parties have devised new forms of mutual co-operation which are particularly effective today and include regular contracts on a bilateral basis as well as regional and international meetings.

However, it should be obvious that changes in the forms of proletarian internationalism, no matter how deep-going, cannot and do not undermine its inherent strength, which cements the unity of the revolutionary working class. After all, it is not a question of form; the point is that each Communist party now has every reason to say as Lenin did on behalf of the Bolshevik Party, speaking of international proletarian solidarity with the young Soviet state: "We have an international alliance, an alliance which has nowhere been registered, which has never been given formal embodiment, which from the point of view of 'constitutional law' means nothing, but which, in the disintegrated capitalist world, actually means everything" (*Coll. Works*, Vol. 30, p. 449).

Marxists-Leninists have never regarded proletarian internationalism as an exclusive, intra-class solidarity ruling out co-operation between the working class and other social and political forces fighting against imperialism, monopoly, colonial and semi-colonial exploitation, for peace, democracy and social progress. Support of the movements for freedom and democracy and vigorous interaction with them are part of the policy of proletarian internationalism.

That democratic unity of action plays a prominent role in today's world politics need hardly be demonstrated. No one will deny the substantial contribution which the revolutionary democratic movement, heterogeneous in class composition but united by a common purpose, has made to the effort to bring about a turn from cold war to detente, and to the struggle of the Vietnamese and other peoples for national liberation against imperialism, colonialism and racism.

Or take the Portuguese revolution. To be sure, its gains are primarily a fruit of the courageous struggle of the Portuguese people themselves. But the possibilities of democratising the country by revolutionary means were considerably increased by widespread international solidarity on which the anti-fascists and democrats of Portugal relied and still rely for support. This is a conclusion drawn and stressed by Portugal's Communists, and I refer to it all the more confidently because it was voiced time and again at the Eighth PCP Congress, an outstanding event I had the privilege of witnessing as a guest.

The Communist Party of Ireland, for its part, considers that it can only press forward its political activity alongside and in close co-operation with the anti-imperialist forces of the world. This line of ours has deep roots and strong traditions. It is a legacy left to the Irish working class by its noted leader, James Connolly, who fought unrelentingly against social chauvinism, for the international unity of all working people and genuine democrats in resisting imperialism and its policy of aggression. Our Party, being loyal to this line, subscribed with deep satisfaction to the common statement of the Berlin Conference that "a Europe of peace and progress can only be the result of many-sided efforts, and the outcome of rapprochement, understanding and co-operation among the broadest political and social forces."

It follows that Communist proletarian internationalism does not preclude but implies effort to extend the social and political range of international movements that are at one on democratic, progressive interests and goals. This must be stressed in no uncertain terms, and I wish to deal with it in greater detail. The fact is that bourgeois ideologues try to detect a "contradiction" in the Marxist-Leninist position on this point and to play it up in such a way as to create the impression that the Communists' class policy deliberately prevents their international unity with other democratic forces.

There is no denying that the line of proletarian internationalism is entirely a class line in both theory and practice. It is inseparable from the Marxist-Leninist world outlook and revolutionary strategy, both of which are likewise based entirely on class principles. In other words, first in this outlook and this strategy as the highest criterion of principled estimations and judgements are the interests and ideals of the working class, which are explicitly posed against those of the bourgeoisie. Buth while taking this approach to the realities of capitalist society, Marxism has never since its emergence gone as far as to draw the primitive conclusion that between the poles of labour and capital there is a vacuum or

social strata that can be ignored. One has only to turn to the *Communist Manifesto* to realise how very foreign such a view was to Marx and Engels.

Lenin took a resolute stand against the wretchedly dogmatic interpreters of Marxism who overlooked the social variegation of capitalism and saw only black and white, saying as it were: "This is the bourgeoisie and that is the proletariat, and there is nothing in between." It was Lenin who said prophetically that "the socialist revolution will not be solely, or chiefly, a struggle of the revolutionary proletarians in each country against their bourgeoisie—no, it will be a struggle of all the imperialist-oppressed colonies and countries, of all independent countries, against international imperialism" (Vol. 30, P.159). Lenin also formulated a truth assimilated by all Communists, to the effect that those who await a socially pure revolution will not live to see it.

Of course, these theoretical propositions tested by experience have never led Marxists-Leninists to the conclusion that since the masses in all countries are drawn into the process of socialist transformation of the world, all that the working class has to do is to merge with them, setting aside its own class interests. The conclusion that suggests itself points the other way: the broader the world front against social and national oppression and the more varied the composition of those who belong to it, the greater the responsibility of the working class for uniting this front, making it effective and giving it a future. And this implies that proletarian internationalism is important as the guiding factor for the international unity of the forces fighting for freedom and democracy.

This guiding role of proletarian internationalism is also growing because world problems affecting the destiny of mankind have become very acute. Bourgeois and reformist ideology construe the increased acuteness of these problems as an argument against proletarian internationalism, for universal problems must be approached from universal and not from class positions, or so these ideologues say. This seems logical at first sight. But let us see how this logic squares, if at all, with present-day social realities.

Take, for instance, the issue of war and peace, the central problem facing the world. The whole of mankind has a stake in its solution, for the nuclear threat is a threat to man's very existence. However, one should not mistake the universal *dimensions* of this problem for its anything but universal *origin*, for the anything but universal *character* of its present state. Indeed, few people now accept the preposterous notion that the danger of world war grows out of man's "aggressive nature". The real roots of this danger lie in imperialism, in its socio-economic structure and policy, as we know only too well.

We all know from the experience of recent years that every step towards easing tensions and putting world politics on a healthy basis is difficult. This is because every constructive solution reached in this matter and meeting universal interests has to be fought for. The immediate manifestations of this fight may be political or diplomatic but ultimately it has a class basis. And it is in this connection that the mobilising and guiding role of a working class united by the principles of proletarian internationalism and operating as the foremost factor in the international movement for peace, as the only force capable of properly orientating the common struggle to banish war from the life of mankind, comes to the fore.

The significance of proletarian internationalism is also revealed by other world problems, such as that of the developing countries. The destiny of the "third world" gives cause for concern to a large body of international opinion. But, again, the problem of the developing countries' future, of speeding their economic progress, cannot be snatched out of the context of the class struggle inside these countries or in the world. This objectively confronts the democratic, national-liberation forces of the world striving to contribute to the solution of the problem with the following choice: either engaging in isolated actions, alternately backing this or that enticing plan holding the promise of "financing the development" of new states but at the same time making them more dependent on imperialist powers: or uniting in struggle to remove the principal obstacle to the developing countries' national progress—imperialism and monopoly, with the system of international exploitation, economic inequality and discrimination created by them. In

the latter case, proletarian internationalism plays a unique part by providing a class political platform that attracts all consistent fighters against the colonial heritage, imperialist oppression and plunder, for the development of the new states.

It follows that, contrary to the allegations of bourgeois ideologues, proletarian internationalism is not "blinkers" said to prevent the Communists from seeing the imperative need to join efforts on a world-wide basis to solve the global problems facing mankind. It is the position of the advanced class of our epoch, which realises its responsibility for the fortunes of the world and insists therefore on adopting an action programme suggested by its own interests but at the same time meeting the interests of all contemporary movements for democracy, freedom, peace and progress.

Recent years have seen in the worldwide ideological and political controversy a phenomenon that strikes one as an incomprehensible paradox. Indeed, the mass media controlled by big capital show concern in the most diverse forms for, of all things, the independence of Communist parties and greater effectiveness of their policy. The bourgeois press harps on the assertion that the gains of the Communists of capitalist countries would be far greater but for the shackles of international class commitments. It tries to talk us into renouncing proletarian internationalism for our own good.

Let us look into the background of the bourgeoisie's calculations disguised with solicitude for its class enemies.

Proletarian internationalism has for decades been a source of strength to every party belonging to the world Communist movement. Now as in the past, every national contingent of the movement rightly lists the solidarity of brother parties as one of its dependable political resources.

All this is an open secret to our class enemies. And it is only natural that they would like very much to dissociate the Communists from proletarian internationalism. This explains their seemingly paradoxical concern for more efficient Communist policy through greater "national independence" of the parties in question. What makes the bourgeois ideologues' arguments futile is the mere fact that they are based entirely on an absurd attempt to prove that the Communists' international and national interests and tasks are "incompatible".

Marxists-Leninists have never been blind to the fact that the different national contingents of the revolutionary working class fight in different conditions. This is an axiom which none but ignoramuses can treat as a sensational discovery. The Communists have always guided themselves by Lenin's statement that "the unity of the international tactics of the communist working-class movement in all countries demands, not the elimination of variety or the suppression of national distinctions... but the application of the *fundamental* principles of communism... which will *correctly modify* these principles in certain *particulars*, correctly adapt and apply them to national and national-state distinctions" (*Coll. Works*, Vol. 31, p.92).

Proletarian internationalism, far from suppressing or denying the independence of each Communist party, insists on it and expects every party to carry on as effective a policy as possible, that is, a creative policy really in keeping with national conditions, for this is the only basis on which a tangible contribution can be made to the common revolutionary struggle. Marxists-Leninists consider it one of their most important duties to safeguard the independence of their parties—not against proletarian internationalism, of course, but against attempts made by the bourgeoisie and reformists with the professed aim of achieving closer unity with broad democratic forces but actually with an eye to imposing on the working-class vanguard ideological and political positions lacking an explicit class character.

To our Party, loyalty to proletarian internationalism means, last but not least, the duty to seek solutions to precisely those problems that face the Irish people and in the interests of precisely the Irish working class. From the point of view of its general, fundamental meaning, we share this position with all brother parties, with all the Communist and Workers' parties of Europe, which stressed at the Berlin Conference that "the struggle of each Party for socialism in its own country and its responsibility towards the working class

and the people of that country are bound up with mutual solidarity among working people *of all countries and all progressive movements and peoples in their struggle for freedom* and the strengthening of their independence, for democracy, socialism and world peace."

It would be an unpardonable mistake for us to overlook the perfectly unambiguous attempts of the imperialists and their ideologues to break up the international Communist and *working-class movement into isolated contingents by arguing that the slogan of* proletarian internationalism is "obsolete" and that the working class of each country should concern itself primarily with national interests.

Needless to say, Communists in Ireland will never accept such an idea. British *imperialism has partitioned our country and this prevents the Irish people, that is, the* working class and its allies, from joining forces in the struggle for freedom, independence, progress and socialism. To carry out this task, we require internationalist assistance and support. We are not alone, nor have we been left to our own devices. We have powerful allies in the world Communist and working-class movement, a fact which gives us strength an courage and makes us confident of the victory to come.

World politics today are more intricate than ever. In this situation, every class and every party strives to determine the guidelines of its strategy and adopt a position most likely to safeguard its interests. The working class has its strategic guidelines—they are provided by Marxism-Leninism. It also has tried and tested principles that play a key role when it specifies its political attitude. They include the principles of proletarian internationalism, the rust-proof class weapon of all working men.

[1]International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties, Moscow, 1969, Prague 1969, p.36.
[2]Ibid.

Interests and the Way of Life Under Socialism

MIECZYSLAW MICHALIK
Polish philosopher

THE new way of life that is becoming established in socialist countries is ultimately conditioned by the standard of living, the level attained by the productive forces and the nature of production relations. Since these manifest themselves primarily as interests (meaning the requirements of diverse classes and social groups and their individual members, which are conditioned by the economic relations prevailing in the society concerned), it should be clear that the evolution of the socialist way of life depends in substantial measure on how far the economic interests of classes and major social groups are harmonised.

Interests are a decisive component of the mechanism of achieving harmony between objective changes in the productive forces and production relations, on the one hand, and the conscious activity of classes and social groups and the behaviour of individuals, on the other. They impinge directly on the basic characteristics of the way of life in the social and political sphere, economic and moral incentives to labour, ways and means of meeting material and cultural requirements and the other in which this is done. Hence ascertaining the system of interests under socialism in general and at the stage of building developed

Continuing the discussion of theoretical and ideological aspects of the socialist way of life. See *WMR*, June and November, 1976.

socialism in particular, as well as the most favourable relationship between them from the point of view of the tasks facing socialist society, is not merely a theoretical problem. It is also the starting point for devising methods of influencing the evolution of the way of life. This article looks into some of the problems.

Prerequisites of Unity

Socialism is the first system in the history of society to provide the objective prerequisites of achieving and building up the unity of the fundamental interests of the working people and of nations and ethnic groups. What are these prerequisites?

Socialism removes the economic basis of irreconcilable, antagonistic contradictions between the interests of classes, social groups and individuals—private ownership of the means of production and the exploitation of man by man—and eliminates the exploiting nlasses themselves. Public ownership of the basic means of production, which socialism establishes, is the material basis for radical changes in social, political and cultural relations, changes which in their totality ensure coincidence of the fundamental interests of all classes and groups of society as a whole and its every member. Let us list the most important of them.

First of all, socialism abolishes inherently capitalist antagonisms in the sphere of labour: the contradiction between necessary and surplus labour, since under socialism both are used for the good of the working people; the contradiction beteen live and reified labour, since under socialism the latter is not a means of exploitation but a means of facilitating labour and of raising its productivity; the contradiction between labour and consumption, since under socialism labour is the measure of consumption and the criterion of the individual's social standing.

Secondly, under socialism there has developed a system of classes and social groups that base their labour on public ownership. This is why relations between them are relations of friendship and co-operation free from inequality in regard to the means of production and the wealth created by society. It is particularly important that, due to the domination of public property, there is no internal limit to the growth of production under socialism as distinct from capitalism. Therefore, it is a law of socialism to increasingly use the growing production forces for improving everyone's standard of living and enable every individual to develop harmoniously irrespective of his social class standing.

Thirdly, the political institutions of socialist society, first of all the ruling Marxist-Leninist party and the state, reflect and take account of the interests of the whole people. For the first time ever, an internal unity has developed between the operation of the objective laws of social development, the policy of the party and state and the fundamental interests of the people, between public wealth and personal well-being.

The coincidence and unity of key economic interests are an essential reason for people's active participation in labour processes and the life of society, and are of decisive importance for the pace of social progress. The experience of our country is a case in point. The Polish people are well aware that the social and economic development of their country benefits them. They have therefore accepted the social and economic programme formulated by the Polish United Workers' Party as an action programme meeting the interests of every class and every group of society, and are vigorously putting it into practice. The slogan "May Poland's strength grow and may her people live in prosperity", now current in our country, is not only expressive of the mutual correspondence of the development of society and that of its individual members but indicates that everyone realises the inseparable connection between his destiny, the standard of quality of his life, and the destiny, requirements and progress of socialist society.

Why Contradictions Exist

The absence of antagonisms, and unity on the decisive issues do not rule out the existence under socialism of contradictory phenomena and trends leading to differences or even clashes of interests. Antagonism and contradiction are not one and the same thing,

as we know. "The former will disappear but the latter will persist under socialism", Lenin pointed out. Otherwise, if all social problems and contradictions had been settled, it would probably no longer be necessary to maintain an intricate system of social management, to evolve andimplement economic and other policies; in fact, life would stand still. But social development laws dictate something different. Life, Lenin wrote, "proceeds by contradictions, and living contradictions are so much richer, more varied and deep in content than they may seem at first sight to a man's mind" (*Coll. Works,* Vol. 34, p. 403).

What, then, is the source of contradictory interests in a society free from social antagonisms? Until recently, some authors from socialist countries put subjective causes first in answering this question. They referred to infringements of the principles and standards of socialist society, the tendency of some individuals to shun work and live at other people's expense, mistakes and shortcomings in leadership. Indeed, experience shows that owing to ill-advised or careless activity, arbitrary decisions and subjectivism, there may arise diverging interests and even contradictions that are not due to objective causes. For instance, at times a factory manager, giving the public interest as the reason, tries to assign the staff overtime work, although it is not really necessary, and to make up in this way for his miscalculations and inefficiency. Thereby he violates the workers' legitimate rights, which means that this practice ultimately runs counter, not only to the interests of the staff, but to those of society.

When a contradiction is due to subjective causes, the reason may be something more than the mistakes or political immaturity of individuals. People often encounter difficulties because they have to apply the necessarily general criteria of public interest to specific instances and to ascertain with their aid the relationship between the interests of a given individual and the collective and society concerned. It is obvious that in a complicated situation, he who discerns and appreciates the highest interests of society and achieves with due regard to them, whether he is a leader or not, unity of the interests of individuals, the collective and society, can make the right decisions and comport himself correctly. Such personal qualities do not develop of themselves. Nor can they be imparted through ideological education only. They form as one gains more experience in various spheres of life, including professional and public, specifically political, activity. The task is to give the people a still greater share in the management of public affairs, particularly production, at all levels, for this helps them fully to realise their personal responsibility to their collectives and to society for their work and the decisions they make.

For all the importance of the issue of conflicting interests due to subjective causes, it would be wrong to deny that the very reality of socialist society gives rise to contradictions which do not depend on people's will but whose analysis largely explains this reality and helps to alter it. This idea has already been stressed in the *WMR* discussion on contradictions under socialism.[1] Participants in the discussion justly noted that objective contradictions are due to both the survival of vestiges of the old world in socialist society and the fact that as the dynamic development of socialism goes on, new problems and contradictions crop up and are solved.

The objective source of a notable part of contradictory interests is differences in the character, content and conditions of labour, social and class distinctions, and application of the principle of distribution according to work at a time when abundance has not yet been achieved. In other words, it lies in the same spheres that also form the basis for the unity of fundamental social interests.

The Socialist Principle of Distribution and Interests

Distribution under socialism is determined by the entire system of its economic and social laws and, in the final analysis, by its highest goal—giving everyone access to material and cultural benefits on an increasingly equal footing and creating conditions for the all-round development of the individual. "Distribution, in so far as it is governed by purely economic considerations," Engels wrote, "will be regulated by the interests of production, and production is most encouraged by a mode of distribution which allows *all*

members of society to develop, maintain and exercise their capacities with maximum universality" (Frederick Engles, *Anti-Dühring*. Moscow, 1959, pp. 276-277). This means that relations of distribution in socialist society are a powerful lever of harmonising personal and public interests, of bringing about closer unity of the social and economic goals of socialism.

The principle operating at the socialist stage is "From each according to his ability, to each according to his work", which corresponds to the economic level achieved by socialism. The experience of our country and other socialist countries shows that this principle is in keeping with the essence of socialism and is both a means of raising the standard of living and a most important incentive to work. Lenin said that distribution is "a method, an instrument, and a means of increasing output" (Vol. 32, p. 448), and time has proved him right.

However, distribution according to work performs both an economic and social function, which manifests itself particularly at the stage of building developed socialism and at that of building communism. The point at issue is how distribution according to work influences the regulation of the interests of classes, groups and individuals and how it brings complete social equality nearer.

Life has shown that distribution according to work, while spurring higher productivity and inducing everyone to raise his professional and cultural standards and unfold his abilities, does not and cannot provide complete equality in meeting the requirements of each. This is due to differences in people's abilities, the quality of their work, the size of their families, and so on. Taking this into consideration, socialist society promotes distribution through public consumption funds in addition to remuneration according to work.

For a long time, economists of socialist countries regarded remuneration as almost the only form of distribution under socialism and in some cases treted payments and other benefits coming from public funds as a variety of wage or salary. The attitude to this form of distribution changes as the foundations of socialism were consolidated and its economic potential grew. To be sure, there are problems that have yet to be dealt with, such as that of the social and economic functions of public funds or of the best ways of using their potentialities. Besides, we know that their role varies from one socialist country to another due to traditions and other national distinctions. However, Marxist-Leninist economists of our countries are at one on the main point. They recognise that public funds are a highly important factor in harmonising interests, achieving greater social equality and making socialist society more homogeneous and closely knit, for they put a number of social benefits within everyone's reach and bring definite categories bigger incomes.

It is out of public funds that society meets important needs of the population, such as care of the rising generation, education, health care, maintenance of disabled and aged persons or the satisfaction of cultural requirements. Thereby this form of distribution fosters genuinely humane relations in our society and helps to create an atmosphere of collectivism and of social security and optimism.

The stage of building developed socialism and perfecting it is characterised by the continuous growth of public consumption funds. However, wages and salaries play a key role in raising the standard of living. It is very important, therefore, to couple differentiation in pay according to quality of work so as to stimulate production with steadily increasing minimum pay so as to reduce the number of low-income families and lessen the difference in pay between high and low-paid categories. This is all the more essential as the scientific and technological revolution tends in certain sectors to widen the gap.

The Sphere of Labour as a Source of Differing Interests

At this stage of economic development, the socialist community combines the achievements of the technological revolution with the advantages of socialism and is going over from extensive to intensive managing methods. However, this process varies in pace

from one sphere of social production to another, which gives rise, not only to the economic problems mentioned earlier, but to social and socio-psychological problems as well.

The main problem of this nature is to cultivate a communist attitude to labour, to transform labour from a duty into the paramount requirement of every person, which is a key objective of socialist society and a decisive condition for its progress. However, there is no solving the problem without taking further steps to perfect production relations (raising the socialisation level of production, perfecting property relations, fostering production specialisation and concentration) and ending the social dissimilarity of labour, that is, differences in the amount of physical effort, creative content, degree of attractiveness, etc. This is now a source of contradiction in interests between the individual and society, contradictions which are more marked in terms of social psychology than others.

Our Party and the brother parties of other socialist countries consider it most important to solve the resultant problems. The programmes of providing the material and technical basis for developed socialism and for communism worked out by recent party congresses, and the social programmes of the countries concerned are closely co-ordinated. They envisage measures to reduce and eventually eliminate heavy manual work, hasten the gradual removal of essential distinctions between mental and physical work, between town and countryside, considerably reduce distinctions in the social—especially the professional, qualificational and educational—composition of society, in the relationship between working time and leisure and in their content.

We believe the first task is the most pressing one from the point of view of removing contradictions of interests between classes and strata, between the individual and society, as well as of using the scientific and technological revolution and its results more fruitfully. As a matter of fact, many people in our country and elsewhere are still engaged in auxiliary operations requiring much physical exertion. This work is becoming less and less attractive, especially to school-leavers, and is less well paid than work in professions created by the technological revolution and fetters utilisation of its achievements. To reduce manual work and then eliminate it altogether, it is indispensable to speed overall mechanisation and automation. This would be a big step towards effacing the essential distinctions between mental and physical work and evolving an optimal composition of society in terms of professional skills.

Towards Harmony in Interests

Although the main source of contradictory interests lies, as has been said, in the basis of socialist society, their removal is a task for both the economic and the social policy of the socialist countries' Communist parties. Unity of economic and social policies underlies the strategy evolved by the Sixth and Seventh PUWP congresses (1971 and 1975).

By carrying out the comprehensive development plan approved by the Sixth Congress, Poland in the 1971-75 period increased its national income by 62 per cent, industrial output 73 and agricultural output 22 per cent. In the same period, real wages went up by an annual average of seven per cent, the total increase amounting to 40 per cent. Average pay in 1975 was 3,500 zlotys compared with 2,235 zlotys in 1970.

Whereas the working people of capitalist countries are in constant fear of losing their jobs and being robbed of the standard of living they have achieved, in our country the right to work has become part of the way of life. In the previous five years, the number of jobs in Poland increased by 1,900,000.

Our country is successfully solving the problem of providing everyone with modern housing. Under the previous five-year plan, it built 1,125,000 new flats meeting higher standards and reconstructed about 100,000 houses. Enormous attention is devoted to mother and child care and measures to improve the medical services.

The decisions of the Seventh Party Congress, too, are aimed at assuring the people's well-being. Under the programme approved by it, the 1976-80 period will see a 40 to 42 per

cent increase in the national income and a 16 to 18 per cent rise in real wages and salaries.

While attaching tremendous importance to steps to raise the standard of life, the PUWP does not regard this as an end in itself in social progress. Speaking to the Seventh Party Congress, Edward Gierek said that "it would be a one-sided policy to link people's welfare to only material wellbeing. People need many other things to be able to call their life full. At the higher development stage of society, increasing importance attaches to social cultural conditions, realisation of one's responsibility for the progress of one's country, a sense of social justice and security, social relations and active participation in the people's life, access to knowledge and culture, health care and proper conditions for rest and reaction, protection of the environment and many other factors".

It follows that in harmonising interests, we must take account of their manifestation in every sphere of life—the economy, social relations, politics, culture, ideology—determine the function of each of these spheres in the socialist way of life and influence their interconnection.

Worthy of special mention is the role of perfecting the political system of socialism in the further harmonisation of interests. This is done, first of all, by carrying forward socialist democracy. Having abolished exploiting classes, socialist society knows no class struggle or irreconcilable social contradictions. This is not to say, however, that there is no need constantly to co-ordinate by political means the most diverse interests, which arise at all levels and in every part of the social structure.

An effective system of socialist democracy has been evolved in the course of socialist construction, which makes it possible to take account of the requirements, aspirations and interests of people and their associations and bring them into line with the interests of society. A major component of this system is the representative government bodies constituted by the people themselves and expressing their will.

Along with them, a tremendous role is played, especially in co-ordinating common interests with those of collectives and individuals, by the democratic bodies through which the working people directly express their will at state level (as during nation-wide discussions of important draft laws) and their interests in economic management (worker self-management conferences in Polish enterprises), culture, sports and other fields. This applies, first of all, to territorial and production collectives with which the greater part of people's interests is linked and in which citizens carry on their public activity. The Communist and Workers' parties of socialist countries make a special effort to promote factory democracy in line with the growing role of the working class in the management of the economy and public affairs generally and to the increasing scale of social production.

The brother parties study and co-ordinate the people's vital interests and requirements and make decisions on ways and means of meeting them in accordance with the objectives of social development. Ideological education is an important instrument used by them in harmoniously combining the interests of individuals, collectives and society.

The moral and cultural spheres of socialist society show the same coincidence of fundamental interests as its economic and political spheres. The overwhelming majority of people in our country accept the moral values and principles expressing the essence of the socialist system, the nature of society and its development. Nevertheless, we are far from having solved all problems in this sphere. Many social problems and contradictions are due to the ideological immaturity of certain members of society, to their lagging social consciousness and inadequate cultural development. Hence the importance of impressing socialist standards and values more deeply on people's minds, of establishing them in people's behaviour and persuading everyone to serve the public interest, gear his activity to it and take an active part in the country's economic and political life.

Reality shows that the unity of interests under socialism is growing year after year. Our countries' achievements in closing the gap between the interests of individuals, the collective and society and in harmonising them are one of the strong advantages of the socialist system and way of life over the capitalist system. All members of society, responding to its care of them, increasingly link their aspirations and plans with serving

the good of their country and people. Achieving complete harmony in interests will take time, of course, and is a matter of the communist future. To visualise the dimensions and nature of this task, we must take account of the totality of the social relations of contemporary socialist society, know its history and see the prospects of its progress. At their congresses the socialist countries' ruling Communist parties have evolved a strategy providing for further progrsss in this direction.

[1]See *WMR*, March and November 1972, February and March 1973.

Viewpoints

The Outlook for the Swedish Working-Class Movement

LARS WERNER
Chairman, Left Party—Communists of Sweden

LAST year's general election in Sweden created a new political situation. First of all, the election was won by a coalition of three bourgeois parties. Except for the war years, this is the first time since 1930 that a rightist government has come to power. The latest developments constitute a serious swing to the right in Swedish politics.

Forming a government of three parties was not the only political solution for the winners. The Centre Party and People's Party rejected the possibility of setting up a government of "the parties of the middle". This solution was advocated, in particular, by the Centrist Youth League. There was also a chance of the Centre Party forming a minority government. Nevertheless, the parties of the middle and petty bourgeoisie preferred to form a government in alliance with the Moderate Coalition Party.

This is the name which the one-time Conservative Party has borne since the late sixties. Having renamed itself "moderate", it has persisted, however, in playing its traditional role as the chief defender of the interests of big capital and a pillar of reaction. This party has for years been financed by big capital. One of the go-betweens in these financial transactions now holds the office of Defence Minister. The rightists have also obtained key posts in the economy, trade and education. Thus, due to the alignment of economic forces in Sweden and to its links with monopoly, the Moderate Coalition Party has secured the leading role in a bourgeois coalition. The fact that the government is headed by the Chairman of the Centre Party, Thorbjörn Fälldin, does not prevent the "moderate" Minister of the Economy, Gösta Bohman, from framing the policies of the new government.

This is not to say that contradictions between various sections of the Swedish bourgeoisie are disappearing. But it means that we must not underrate their effort and ability to manoeuvre in order to hold and strengthen the bourgeois front.

The new government's policy-making will be dominated by the interests of big capital, which is nothing new. There will be no qualitative changes in this respect compared with the position of the Social Democratic Government, which did its best to manage Swedish capitalism as efficiently as possible. The difference is that the bourgeois government reckons less with the working people's sentiments and opinions and will give less attention to their interests. The new element is the Government's *open* defence of capitalist interests.

The three bourgeois parties had no common programme prior to the election. However, the government's political declaration, though vague, assailed struggle of wage labour for

a higher standard of living. At its meeting on October 9-10, 1976, the LPC Executive described the new government as an active opponent of the growing influence of organised labour in the enterprises and in society at large. It stressed that concentration of production and capital would be speeded under the bourgeois government and that Swedish and multinational monopolies would grow stronger still.

The change of government was a result of a relatively unimportant shift in the electorate's preferences. The victorious bourgeois parties polled two per cent more votes than earlier, the Social Democrats lost 0.8 per cent and the LPC 0.5 per cent. Besides, these parties won 0.4 per cent of the votes from the Christian Democratic Union. To be sure, the outcome of the election is not merely a matter of redistribution of fractional percentages of the vote. Irrespective of what the shifts mean to the working-class movement or the bourgeoisie, the results should be assessed in more general terms.

The Swedish capitalists' opportunities for expansion are running out. The economic and social advance which benefited reformism throughout the 44 years of Social Democratic rule is coming to a halt. Owing to capitalist contradictions, one enterprise after another closes down or is threatened with a shut-down in the steel, shipbuilding, textile, garment, glass and rubber industries.

New urban development is often suspended, as in Lulea, which found itself on the brink of economic catastrophe. With the beginning of the crisis in the steel industry, financial magnates began to campaign against the construction by the government of the Stalverk 80 and Norrbotten plants. Initial concessions to them were made by the Social Democratic government. And now, under the new government, it turns out that these plants will employ only 4,000 workers instead of the 9,000 planned originally. In other words, "Swedish socialism" looks more and more like ordinary capitalism stricken with crisis.

The election showed that the Social Democrats were made responsible for a policy which over the past decades had led to the ruin of hundreds of thousands of small employers in agriculture and other economic fields. Sweden was not spared imbalances in regional development, which have become a law of capitalist society. The Social Democrats' policy brought about massive migration of labour to where the interests of big business required it. Most migrants moved from Norrland and Bergslagen, areas rich in forests and raw materials, to the "concrete Ghettos" of big cities.

Election results were also influenced by the Social Democrats' failure to realise the hope of the electorate for less red tape and greater popular participation in the improvement and protection of the environment. The Centrists skilfully exploited the people's disappointment. Besides, the bourgeois parties achieved victory by using populist methods and lavishing unrealistic promises.

The October meeting ofthe LPC Executive pointed out that the Social Democrats' setback was due mainly to their policy based on the concept of class collaboration. Today the negative aspects of this anything but new concept are making themselves felt.

In Sweden as elsewhere, the capitalist system has created problems that can only be solved through radical measures leading to a socialist future. Yet, instead of proceeding along these lines, the Social Democratic government constantly increased aid to financial magnates and promoted co-operation with the bourgeois parties.

During the election campaign, this found expression in the Social Democratic Labour Party's posing as a "party of the middle". The government did little to beat off the bourgeoisie's violent attacks on the proposals advanced by the Confederation of Swedish Trade Unions. These proposals included socialisation of the land to put an end to speculation in building lots, and the setting up of a so-called non-distributable working people's fund by deducting a definite percentage of corporate profits. The Social Democrats' position during the election campaign by no means encouraged the workers' aspiration to a radical solution of the problem through compensated nationalisation of capitalist property proposed by the trade unions.

The Confederation newspaper, *Aftonbladet*, summing up the election campaign,

condemned that position. "For the Social Democrats," it wrote, "it would be disastrous t agree with the bourgeois parties' allegation that the issue of the working people's fund an that of socialising building lots ... had lost them the election. The Social Democrat should identify themselves more explicitly with the workers' demands, insist on the righ of labour to influence affairs at the enterprise, expose the concentration of power i capitalist hands and show how property can be democratised."[1]

On the issue of developing the nation's atomic industry, the SDLP carried on the polic followed by the Moderate Coalition Party although more and more facts showed that th problem of safety in the atomic industry and in the disposal of nuclear wastes had not bee solved reliably enough.

As a result, many voters among the workers gained the impression that the SDLP ha no particular advantages over the bourgeois parties. Social Democratic policy ha objectively played into the hands of the bourgeois opposition, which saw the mai purpose of the election in a change of government. In the end, the opposition's appeal t break the Social Democrats' "one-party rule" brought response from even some of thos voters who earlier had backed the Social Democrats and from many of those who vote for the first time.

The meeting of the LPC Executive pointed out that the decline in the Social Democrats influence would continue for so long as they favoured class collaboration.

A further matter claiming attention is the reason for our loss of votes in the lates election. We consider that on the whole our election manifesto posed the various problem correctly. But the Party Executive at its meeting noted self-critically that work in th enterprises had been inadequate. It must be carried on much more vigorously. Th Communists have yet to win sufficiently strong positions in the enterprises, which i indispensable if the Party is to increase its political leverage and become a mass party. Th year 1977, when our Party will mark its 60th anniversary, has been declared a year o struggle for influence in the factories.

The fiercest attacks of the bourgeoisie during the election were understandably directe against the working-class movement, primarily against the Communists. The bourgeoisi hoped that it would succeed in pushing the LPC beyond the four per cent barrier and thu deprive it of all its seats in parliament.[2] The contect of the anti-Communist campaign wa the same as usual. We were made out to be a party whose national and democrati character was "open to question". At first this slander was echoed by the Socia Democrats. But when they saw how very strong winds were blowing from the right the stopped it. During the election campaign they desisted almost completely from their usua anti-Communist attacks.

Bourgeois propaganda also make much of the existence in the LPC of a minorit disagreeing with the Party leadership on certain issues. There were interviews with som members of this minority, which had joined in communal elections on its own. Som inner-Party documents were made available to the mass media. There were persona attacks on members of the Party Executive. All this provided the class enemy with a opportunity to claim that the LPC was split, and limited the Party's possibilities o rallying voters in support of the correct propositions of its electoral manifesto. Confidenc in us as advocates of a socialist alternative basing their programme on independen analysis of Swedish realities, the alignment of class forces and the given state of the clas struggle was shaken.

It has been said that central to the bourgeoisie's election strategy was its bid for a chang of government, which also found reflection in radio and TV broadcasts. Interviews an debates were so calculated as to impair the LPC's electoral chances.[3] The fact that w Communists were able, nevertheless, to retain 17 of the earlier 19 seats in the Riksdag wa a big victory for our activists and sympathisers, who had done a good job. We are just a grateful to the Communist Youth organisation and to hundreds of young women active i the women's movement for their contribution.

The change of government which has come about after all both increases and reduce

the opportunities of mobilising the workers and other working people in the struggle for a socialist policy. People realise more than ever that "Swedish socialism", publicised by the Social Democrats, was not based on real power but on political illusions. The Social Democrats' departure from the government also laid bare the nature of the Swedish state machinery, which turned out to have been a bourgeois, capitalist machinery all the time. This makes it easier to expose the ideology of class collaboration and pursue a more radical policy.

On the other hand, we are witnessing a direct coincidence of the interests of big capital, the state apparatus, the bourgeois government and the mass media controlled in the main by the bourgeoisie. This means that the rightists, who want to step up their pressure on the working-class movement, above all on its socialist-minded contingents, now have new important facilities at their disposal.

Victory in the election whetted the appetite of the bourgeoisie. Radio and television today allot much time for various reactionary broadcasts. The demand for Sweden's entry into the Common Market approved by a meeting of the Young Conservatives organisation on November 27-28, 1976, was given extraordinary publicity. The young reactionaries also insisted on restricting aid to the developing countries to actions recommended by the UN, on selling government enterprises to private persons and reducing the economic activity of the state to "aiding" private capital at the taxpayers' expense to overcome economic difficulties.

And here is another example. At an inter-industry conference on rationalisation (Stockholm November 24, 1976), Pehr Gyllenhammar, head of the Volvo corporation, said that "universal military" service in industry would be one of the ways of solving a problem that will arise if no one wants to work in industry. The call-up period should be two years and should include regular training."[4] Cyllenhammar criticised the practice of creating new jobs in the public sector and other jobs provided artificially which he believes society does not need. "Let us leave a gap and create a vacuum to enable industry to grow on its own and thus create the requisite jobs,[5]" he said.

It would be hard to imagine a more outspoken plea for institutionalising mass unemployment and using forced labour in the name of capitalist profit. The Swedish working-class movement will undoubtedly reject this spurious rationalisation, which is *reminiscent of fascist-like plans of militarising the work force.*

The Swedish Employers' Confederation (SAF) made what *Aftonbladet* described as an "extremely reactionary" move in advance of the renegotiation of collective agreements due in 1977. It no longer confines itself to demanding a wage freeze, but calls for a simultaneous cut in social spending. Instead of a general reduction of the working day to seven hours, which the trade unions, and especially the women's movement, have been demanding for a long time, the SAF advocates the gradual abolition of certain days off.

On December 4, 1976, the Stockholm branch of the Confederation of Swedish Trade Unions organised a protest demonstration involving 15,000 people against the SAF's intentions. With the exception of May Day demonstrations, it was the first mass action by working people in 45 years to be sponsored by the Stockholm trade unions. On the eve of the protest action, the Stockholm organisation of the LPC urged the workers to fight for unity against the policy of financial magnates and right-wing rule.

Sweden is entering a period of intensifying class struggles. Our working-class movement may be said to have reached a crossroads. The magnates of finance and their spokesmen in the bourgeois government cannot be fought effectively by falling back on the social democratic practice of class collaboration, for it is the policy of class collaboration that has created the present situation.

What are the conclusions drawn by our Party Executive in this connection? First of all, we must find ways and means of mobilising the whole working-class movement and preparing it for an offensive against the power of financial magnates. In our conditions, democratic reforms are of strategic importance as a means of ending monopoly domination.

A new Law on Participation, granting wage and salary earners the right to influence the affairs of enterprises, became effective in January 1977. Olof Palme, the former Prime Minister, has described this law as the greatest reform since universal suffrage was introduced in Sweden. Yet the law does not grant the working people the comprehensive democratic rights at the enterprise demanded by the trade unions. It extends the unions' right to participate in negotiations and obtain information, as well as a limited right of veto on matters relating to contracts and a limited advantage in interpreting some agreements. On the other hand, it commits them more heavily to maintain "social peace" during the operation of collective agreements.

We Communists consider that the trade unions, while campaigning against the conclusion of agreements that virtually facilitate class collaboration, should seek new rights helping to extend the class struggle. Among other things, we demand: (a) the right of veto in decision-making on the shut-down, transfer or sale of enterprises; (b) a real right to strike and a ban on the practice of blacklisting and sacking strikers; (c) an end to fines for striking; (d) an end to the ban on trade union solidarity action and on the collection of relief funds for strikers; (e) the right to hold trade union meetings during working hours; (f) the right to political activity in the enterprises.

The alternative we advance is a radical working-class government paving the way for socialist changes. This goal can be achieved provided the whole working-class movement starts a dialogue on what socialism in Sweden will be like.

The need of such a dialogue is indirectly acknowledged by *Aftonbladet*, the trade union paper. "A constructive programme of one's own," it wrote after criticising the Social Democrats' passivity as an opposition, "is no less important than activity as an opposition party. First and foremost, the Social Democrats must specify what they mean by democratic socialism, a planned economy and economic democracy. Perhaps they will do so. . ."[4]

Ever since the forties, the LPC has been carrying on important work by opening the people's eyes to the tremendous concentration of capital and power in Sweden. Today it is evident how much more mature the trade union movement has become in recent years. This means that there are considerably better opportunities now to achieve broad-based unity in the country against the magnates of finance and the concentration of power in private hands, a power whose abolition depends on whether a popular majority will be able to bring material production under its control.

We must unfold our ideological activity in the working-class movement in a new way. One of the questions to spell out concerns the function of the working people's non-distributable funds, a project being discussed by the Confederation of Swedish Trade Unions. This function must not be associated with the market economy. The funds can be useful provided they serve to increase the workers' influence in their fight against capitalism. Their function should be associated with the struggle for a planned economy, against the bourgeois state. The struggle for workers' power in the enterprises should be combined with the more general struggle for socialism. The Party must constantly devise new methods of accomplishing its fundamental task, which is to link the working-class movement with socialism. This largely implies more effective work among the younger generation.

But above all else, the Party must be much more energetic than in the past, must promote the struggle of the masses for their immediate interests and join more actively in it. At the threshold of the renegotiation of collective agreements due in 1977, we call on all trade unionists to participate jointly and from the first in the formulation of demands for higher pay. The various groups of working people must campaign together for higher pay if they want to get a bigger share of the fruits of their labour. They must seek higher wages and salaries at the expense of corporate profits and demand safe working conditions fit for man.

The struggle for a price freeze on necessities, the abolition of the indirect food tax and an end to rent increases should become a mass movement. The importance of this action

should be publicised in the factories, residential neighbourhoods, the trade unions, among tenants and in the various popular movements.

To achieve equality for women, we demand equal pay for equal work and higher remuneration for traditionally female jobs. We insist on reducing the working day for all and not merely for those who have children under age. We demand proper institutions for all children, for this is a prerequisite of equal rights for women and of improving the overall social climate. These measures should become part of the general struggle to end unemployment among women.

The Communists consider it necessary immediately to stop atomic energy production in Sweden and to hold a referendum on this issue. Energy problems should be examined in the light of a new industrial polich aimed at expanding the manufacturing industries creating more jobs, reducing energy consumption and calling a halt to reckless exploitation of the country's natural resources.

In mid-December, 1976, the Riksdag group of the LPC visited plants threatened with closing down, and discussed with workers the need of a government industrial programme. The primary demands were listed as follows: curb the influence of big private capital, introduce indicative planning and investment control and change economic structures on a plan basis.

The LPC supports the Communist Youth campaign to collect signatures to the appeal "Equal pay for equal work. Grant rights to student apprentices."

International solidarity and the struggle against the exploitation of the peoples of developing countries by Swedish big capital are vastly important today. We cannot allow aid to the liberation movements of South Africa and other regions to be cut off. The LPC supports the anti-fascist fighters of Chile, the democratic opposition in Spain and the effort for economic rehabilitation in Indochina, and declares for a fair settlement of the Palestine question.

On December 18-19, 1976, the LPC Executive resolved to celebrate the 60th anniversary of the Party in May 1977, under the slogan of international solidarity. Brother parties will be invited to the festivities that are to take place in Stockholm and other cities.

---

[1]*Aftonbladet*, September 22, 1976.

[2]Under Swedish law, a party which has won less than four per cent of the votes is barred from parliament.—*Ed.*

[3]It should be borne in mind that in a number of cases the Social Democratic government stayed in power due to support from the Communist MPs.—*Ed.*

[4]*Svenska Dagbladet*, November 25, 1976, p. 22

[5]Ibid.

[6]*Aftonbladet*, November 14, 1976, p.2.

Effective Contribution to European Security

GEORGE MACOVESCU
Member CC CP Rumania, Minister of Foreign Affairs

THE Bucharest Meeting of the Warsaw Treaty Political Consultative Committee (PCC) November 25-26, 1976, was an outstanding international event demonstrating a consistent desire to contribute effectively to detente, European and world peace and co-operation. In a constructive atmosphere of fraternal friendship and comradely co-operation, party and state leaders of the member countries discussed issues of prim

importance not only to these countries but to all the peoples of Europe. The ways
means were examined of imparting fresh impetus to the efforts to establish security ar
lasting peace, develop genuine co-operation on the European continent.

The Conference showed clearly the great responsibility of the socialist countries for
destinies of detente, peace and security the world over and for the future of mankind. T
expressed the main trait of the socialist countries' foreign policy. Sixty years ago Le
held that the concepts of socialism and peace were closely connected. The policy of pe
and co-operation founded on respect for national independence and sovereignty, is tr
inherent in socialism. Peoples building socialism need peace to be able to turn tl
attention wholly to building the new system, all peoples need peace for their economic
social progress.

The PCC Conference showed the determination of the Warsaw Treaty countries to
the peoples' hopes for peace and progress fulfilled. Ten years ago, also in Bucharest, th
same countries raised the question of convening a European security conference
issued an appeal to all the countries of the continent. The result was the Conference
European Security and Co-operation in Helsinki in the summer of 1975. Its success wa
historic importance to the political affairs of Europe; it opened broad horizons for
struggle for peace, detente and co-operation on the continent.

The Conference pointed out that as a result of the efforts by the world's progress
forces, profound revolutionary, social and national transformations are taking place
Europe and the world over and that on the international scene there is a sharp turn in
balance of forces in favour of peace and progress.

A distinctive feature of this process is the people's determination to put an end to the
imperialist policy of domination and diktat, and to be masters of their future, th
national resources, to live as they choose without outside interference. The struggle wag
by progressive forces for a new policy of equality and mutual advantage is growing
scope and there is a mounting tendency in some capitalist countries towards a m
independent policy. Thanks to these changes and energetic actions by the peoples, a n
course has appeared in world development towards detente and co-operation and
socialist countries' policy of peace and co-operation has played a large role in present-c
world events. The emergent and non-aligned states and those that are following the rc
of independent socio-economic development have likewise helped to improve
international climate.

This course, however, has just been started and is not yet irreversible in character. Th
still are reactionary forces hostile to detente capable of endangering peace and securi
These forces are prepared to interfere in the affairs of other states, are fanning the ar
race, particularly of nuclear weapons, and are intent on reviving cold war tensions. Th
facts, as never before, make it imperative that the socialist countries, the democrat
progressive and anti-imperialist forces and all the peoples multiply their efforts to creat
new international climate of security and co-operation among all nations of the worl

These were the goals of the PCC Conference.

The Final Act of the Helsinki Conference on European Security and Co-operati
marked the beginning of new relations on the continent guaranteeing security and pea
For this process to continue it is important that the signatories fulfil all the poin
principles and obligations of the Final Act. This is a pressing problem requiring untiri
an concerted efforts by all European countries and peoples. This would be in the spirit
the PCC documents.

The Declaration signed by the Warsaw Treaty member-states in Bucharest, "For t
Further Advancement of Detente and for the Consolidation of Security and t
Development of Co-operation in Europe", contains realistic proposals covering ma
areas essential to a positive development of Europe's political affairs. Commenting t
Declaration during a luncheon in honour of the delegations attending the Conferen
General Secretary of the Rumanian Communist Party and President of the Repub
Nicolae Ceausescu said: "This Declaration is an important document demonstrating o

countries' concern with actively contributing to the common efforts to consolidate European security and co-operation and settle the complex problems facing the continent and mankind today in the interests of peace and international co-operation. This document expresses the determination of the socialist countries, members of the Warsaw Treaty organisation, to continue working energetically and in line with the new initiatives to see that the principles and articles of the Helsinki documents are fulfilled, to create a climate of trust and unobstructed co-operation among the peoples of Europe and the world".

Security and lasting peace in Europe are closely bound up with effective steps towards military disengagement and disarmament. The scale of the arms race today, however, is cause for serious concern. And it is in Europe that there is an historically unprecedented concentration of armed forces and arsenals of modern weaponry, including the nuclear weapon. The military budgets of the countries participating in the Conference of European Security and Co-operation account for approximately 80 per cent of the world's military expenditures. For this reason the Declaration of the Bucharest meeting says: "To stop the arms race and carry out disarmament, in the first place nuclear disarmament, to remove the threat of a new world war are the most acute and urgent tasks of our time. Without this it is impossible to make positive tendencies in the development of international relations truly irreversible, it is impossible to ensure genuine security in the world."

On the basis of these realities and evaluations the Conference emphasised the need for extending political relaxation through measures to liquidate the military confrontation and strongly urged disarmament. The socialist countries, members of the Warsaw Treaty organisation, pledged to work for a steady reduction of armed forces and armaments in Central Europe and the continent as a whole and for this process to affect national armed forces an also troops stationed on foreign territory.

At the same time, the Warsaw Treaty countries focused particular attention on stopping the nuclear arms race and consolidating nuclear non-proliferation, while ensuring accessability to all states, discriminating against none, to nuclear energy for peaceful purposes. Their determination to help abolish the danger of a nuclear war is seen in the proposal that all countries, signatories of the Final Act of the Conference on European Security and Co-operation pledge not to be the first to use nuclear weapons against one other. This proposal by the Warsaw Treaty countries underlies the foundation of their draft of a multilateral treaty.

There are also other disarmament proposals in the Bucharest Declaration: prohibiting and destroying the chemical weapon, prohibiting the designing of new types and systems of weapons of mass annihilation, reducing armed forces and conventional arms, dismantling military bases on foreign territory and evacuating armed forces from other countries, establishing peace zones in various regions, and reducing military budgets. The Declaration confirms the readiness of the Warsaw Treaty countries to hold business-like talks on these problems. The Conference participants also urged holding a special session of the UN General Assembly to discuss disarmament. It is gratifying that recently the UN General Assembly voted to convene a special session in 1978.

The socialist Warsaw Treaty countries reaffirmed their view that the world should not be divided into opposing military blocs. In the Declaration the participants state their readiness to dissolve the Warsaw Treaty organisation simultaneously with NATO and, as a first step, to abolish their military organisations. This step, proposed some time ago by the socialist countries, would help normalise international relations.

A gradual reduction in the activities of military blocs would undoubtedly help achiev this key political goal. Equally helpful would be the Conference decision for the membe countries to exchange advice and information of a consultative character on security an peace in Europe and the world over; the Declaration appeal to all states not to take actio which could enlarge existing or create new, exclusive groups and military-politica alliances, and the concrete proposals to simultaneously terminate the validity of thos

articles of the Warsaw Treaty and NATO providing for admission of new membe

The Declaration likewise states the determination of the participating countrie support any steps in Europe or its regions to establish good-neighbourly, frie relations and co-operation among states as an effective contribution to security on continent. The socialist countries have invariably shown initiative by introducing conc proposals, such as the Soviet Union's proposal to withdraw all naval vessels and nuc armed submarines from the Mediterranean Sea; Rumania's proposal to turn the Balk into a zone of co-operation and peace free of nuclear weapons, and proposals by ot socialist countries for their geographical regions. Such zones in various parts of Eur and the world would not be detrimental to any country or group of countries, but, on contrary, would be in the interests of the people's inhabiting a given region, the interest peace, security and co-operation in Europe and the world.

Broad multilateral economic, scientific and technological co-operation among countries of the continent are cardinal to establishing security and peace in Europe. participants in the conference paid particular attention to these problems because t believe, as experience has shown, that growing trade, industrial, scientific and techni ties, stimulating progress and better living conditions, are in the interests of all states. W aware of this, the socialist countries attending the PCC Conference expressed th determination to promote long-term and large-scale co-operation with all count concerned. Fulfilment of the Declaration proposals to hold inter-state conferences on all-European scale on various questions would contribute to this. Such co-operati based on equality and mutual advantage, is still obstructed today by the many restrictic and the discrimination dating back to the cold war days, by such methods as us economic ties for political pressure. All peoples are interested in seeing these artifi barriers removed. The socialist countries have insisted on this for years and this confirmed by the Bucharest Declaration.

Today, when efforts are being made to establish a new international economic or which would abolish the remains of the obsolete and unfair relations of exploitati imperialist, colonialist and neo-colonialist domination of nations, of particu importance is the Conference stand, as stressed in the Declaration, that Europe economic co-operation cannot be isolated from world economic relations. Internatio economic relations, the PCC Conference clearly stated, should be reconstructed on a f basis, on the principles of equality of all states, large and small, socialist and capitali developed and developing. The participants expressed their solidarity and support for t purposeful programme on international co-operation proposed by the developing a non-aligned countries.

The countries attending the PCC Conference also discussed expanding co-operation culture, science, education, information and contacts among people as a means improving the political climate in Europe. They approved of effectively using t opportunities agreed on in the Final Act of the European Conference, for a grea exchange of cultural values, for this would benefit every nation individually and Europe and world civilisation as a whole. For Europe the participants suggested festiva competitions, exhibitions and other cultural undertakings. This would undoubted improve mutual understanding, broaden contacts among the populations of Europe countries making the treasures of world civilisation more accessible. Proceeding on t principles of socialist humanism they stressed the necessity of ensuring all people on t continent appropriate working and living conditions, abolishing unemployment, bringi the achievements of science, technology and culture within the reach of all, educating t youth in the spirit of progress, peace and co-operation among nations, using the media give the public an undistorted picture of international events and to bring peoples clos together.

There is every reason to say that the Declaration and other PCC documents open t way to new joint moves towards security and peace on the European continent. T realities and complexities of the international situation require that all the socialist,

European countries increase their efforts for security and detente. Concrete measures must be taken to carry out all that had been agreed on in the Final Act. Preparations must be made for the 1977 Belgrade meeting of representatives of countries that attended the European Conference, using the experience of inter-state co-operation, gained in fulfilling the Final Act provisions. This meeting should be a strong stimulus to consolidating security and developing co-operation in Europe by adopting a programme of action to attain these goals. The facts show that to do this, to consolidate European security, besides government and diplomatic activity it is important to mobilise broad sections of the public holding differing political, philosophical and religious views, to step up the peoples' struggle, the struggle of the broad masses who play the decisive role in determining the direction of historical development. Peace, freedom and independent national assertion objectively unite all peoples and require common action by all conscientious forces upon whom depends the fulfilment of practical tasks. For this reason the Warsaw Treaty countries attending the Conference state in the Declaration that they are prepared to co-operate with all progressive forces and democratic movements, with all peace forces for a lasting European and world peace.

A key prerequisite of peace and progress, the Conference noted, is greater solidarity of the socialist countries. It is, therefore, notable that the declaration speaks of the determination of each of the participating states to strengthen all-round equal co-operation and friendship with socialist countries that are not members of the Warsaw Treaty organisation. The Conference Communique points out, nevertheless, that "... to further improve the mechanism of political co-operation within the framework of the Treaty, it has been decided to establish a Committee of Foreign Ministers and a Joint Secretariat as Organs of the Political Consultative Committee".

The Bucharest Conference and its documents show that meetings and discussions, held in a spirit of mutual understanding and comradely co-operation, receptiveness and mutual respect, are fruitful, help strengthen solidarity and unity and attain the noble goals of detente and understanding in Europe and the rest of the world. The participating states, says the Declaration, confirmed their determination to "continually build up co-operation among themselves on the principles of Marxism-Leninism and international solidarity, respect for the equality and sovereignty of each state, non-interference in internal affairs and comradely mutual aid".

The people of Rumania applaud the results of the PCC Conference of the Warsaw Treaty countries. In their creative endeavour and selfless efforts to build a well-developed socialist society and fulfil the Programme of the 11th Congress of the Communist Party of Rumania, the Rumanian people, together with the peoples of other socialist countries, with all the forces of the broad anti-imperialist front, are determined to work with equal energy for detente and world peace. When discussing the report by Nicolae Ceausescu on the work of the PCC Conference, the CP Political Executive stated that "the Rumanian Socialist Republic would strengthen co-operation with the Warsaw Treaty countries, with all socialist countries to attain a lasting security and broad co-operation among all the nations of our continent".

National and International Factor in Our Struggle

CARLOS ABOIM INGLES
CC Member, Portuguese Communist Party

THE years of our revolution have been a period of testing every aspect of the Par strategy. Experience has proved that the principles which have always guided Communists in the struggle for the interests of the working class and the people, democracy and the socialist future of our country, are correct.

One of the principles of our revolutionary strategy is, unquestionably, proletar internationalism.

We have always realised that our struggle and the future of Portugal are insepara from events and the balance of forces in the international arena. Moreover, connection necessarily becomes interaction. On the one hand, favourable change world politics, progress in vindicating the norms of peaceful coexistence, and gains of revolutionary forces help to strengthen the positions of democrats, who are fighting the social progress of Portugal. On the other hand, the gains of the Portuguese revolut benefit the international situation and contribute, as our foreign friends stress, to struggle of the workers and peoples of the world for social and national emancipatic

We note with satisfaction that this matter was discussed at length in PCP organisati during preparations for the Eighth Party Congress. It was the subject of numer discussions which invite two conclusions. First, the discussions revealed that Communists appreciate and support our central Committee's appraisal of the situat and the fundamental policy adopted by the Party leadership. In fact, less than a dozer the more than 300 proposals and remarks made were at variance with the ove tendency. Over half the amendments were included in the document submitted to congress, and the rest were not taken into account solely because they did not go beyc specifying various propositions advanced in more general terms in the CC report.

Second, the discussions were evidence that the Party is well aware of the imperat need to continue paying close attention to the connection between the Portugu revolution and contemporary international processes.

Imperialism has lost its former might. But this does not mean it has become powerl and helpless. As well as changing its tactics and using new methods to adapt to the n nternational situation, which is favourable to the forces of peace, democracy, natio ndependence and socialism, imperialism continues to resort to the old harsh metho disregarding the principles of peaceful coexistence. We must remember that the nature mperialism has not changed, as our own experience indicates.

All this obliges us to be realistic. In other words, we must firmly resist provocation, matter where it comes from—whether from the imperialists themselves, from "leftists", from adventurers obsessed by impatience. Secondly, we must realise that today peoples have both a right to live in peace and shape their destinies and grea opportunities to do so than before. In view of this, we must resolutely counter imperial nterference, pressure and blackmail.

Imperialism has lost its historical initiative. This estimation of a most important asp of the present-day stage of world development—an estimation made by the 1969 Meeti of Communist and Workers' Parties—is confirmed time and again. Life shows that it w based on a correct analysis of the operation of all objective and subjective factc moulding the character of today's world. Nor is the estimation one-sided, for it does n discount the passing gains of imperialism in this or that country or region. However, stresses the much greater significance of the outstanding victories achieved, or bei

achieved by peoples in the struggle for freedom. This conclusion has been proved corre once again by the deterioration in recent years of the general crisis of capitalism in th social, economic, political, cultural and moral spheres.

At the same time, the ideals and real achievements of socialism strengthen the will of growing mass of people on the globe and inspire their labour and struggle. Our eventfı epoch, which abounds in forms of public activity, is the epoch of transition fror capitalism to socialism. This is confirmed by the Portuguese revolution, which attracts th attention of friend and foe alike. Its significance and experience are worthy of deepe study by revolutionaries fighting for the social progress of their peoples. We Portugues revolutionaries, for our part, consider it our duty to analyse this experience.

Indeed, our revolution, which has done away with state monopoly capitalism i Portugal and opened the road to socialism, is the first revolution in decades to have bee accomplished in the European area of developed capitalism. While the situation in ou country is unique, we are witnessing a new experience from which lessons of univers value can be drawn.

The Portuguese revolution shows that international detente and peaceful coexistenc neither rule out the class struggle, nor hamper social change. The change in internation relations in favour of peace has nothing to do with establishing what is known as "strategic balance of spheres of influence", that is, in effect, with discontinuing the struggl for social progress. Nor has it anything in common with reorienting this struggl according to pretentious formulas of regional or "geopolitical" homogeneity which ignoı the uneven character of development of the capitalist countries, deny inevitabl differences in the forms and pace of the revolutionary process and, as a result, slow dow and cause stagnation in each particular national movement and in all of them take together.

The Portuguese revolution is further evidence that the general laws of revolutionaı development exist and operate but that their existence manifests itself in distinctive form Lenin stressed that revolutions never repeat one another, that is, can never be copie There can be no "common yardstick" or "single model" for solving the urgent problen encountered by every revolution. Creative activity by the masses is the real maker ‹ history. Every revolutionary experience is richer than any theoretical postulat proposition or conclusion. With the 60th anniversary of the Great October drawing nea it is worth recalling that this truth was confirmed in a most convincing manner by the fir victorious socialist revolution. The experience of our revolution is a fresh confirmation ‹ it.

The Portuguese revolution has demonstrated beyond all doubt the strong connectio between the struggle waged by the working class and its vanguard, on the one hand, an the national liberation movement of oppressed peoples, on the other. Mutual solidarit merges these forces in one stream of struggle for the social and national emancipation ‹ the workers and the people, giving them the historical initiative.

The Portuguese revolution is an embodiment of the dialectics of the interaction ‹ external and internal factors in the revolutionary process, of the dynamic combination ‹ internationalism and independence characterising the activity of a revolutionary part The favourable evolution of the world political situation and active internation solidarity with the Portuguese revolution raised serious obstacles to the pressure ‹ imperialism, to its interference in the affairs of our country. Portugal's Communis greatly appreciate this internationalist contribution to our revolution and never forget i But, of course, the decisive successes of the revolution are due primarily to the initiati and struggle of the Portuguese people themselves. This is convincing proof th internationalist co-operation is no hindrance to independent work and struggle of revolutionary party.

Many other features of the Portuguese revolution (worker control, the agrarian refor public information, Constitutional consolidation of change, concrete expression of tl common will of social alliances, the role of the armed forces, the relationship betwe

political power and mass action, and so on) must be carefully studied in the light of t
progress made, existing shortcomings, unique specifics and general laws.

Our Party has done a good deal to acquaint world opinion as thoroughly as possil
with the distinctive character of the Portuguese revolution. There is no doubt, howev
that our internationalist duty is to do more on these lines.

The Communists of Portugal firmly adhere to class positions while at the same ti
upholding the country's national interests. The interests of the working class and otl
labouring elements coincide with the aspirations of all anti-monopoly forces, with t
genuine national interest of the Portuguese people. Now as in the past, the PCP is t
embodiment of the conscience and honour of the nation.

The Party steadfastly resists imperialist meddling in the internal affairs of Portugal a
fights against conspiracies and concessions that lead to the preservation and aggravati
of a dependence due to the country's historical lag and to a legacy of almost five decades
fascist rule. It maintains national independence and helps to reinforce it, championing
foreign policy that would enable Portugal to maintain the freedom it has won and ensu
its people's social and economic progress while at the same time serving the cause of peac
security, co-operation and social progress all over the world. The PCP strives to ensu
that Portugal carries on its foreign policy unswervingly, in strict accordance with tl
provisions of the Constitution, specifically Article 7. This means respecting certa
standards and principles expressing the people's will. They include the following:

—Portugal shall guide itself by the principles of national independence, the right
nations to self-determination and independence, the equality of states, peaceful settleme
of international conflicts, non-interference in the affairs of other countries, and c
operation with other nations in the interest of the emancipation and progress of mankind

—Portugal shall declare for the elimination of every form of imperialism, colonialis
and aggression, for universal, simultaneous and controlled disarmament, the dissolutic
of military-political blocs and the establishment of a collective security system to brir
into being a world order that would guarantee peace and equitable relations betwe
nations.

—Portugal shall recognise the right of peoples to fight against every form of oppressio
against imperialism and colonialism. It shall maintain particularly close relations
friendship and co-operation with Portuguese-speaking countries.

This is the gist of the principles and lines of action in regard to Portugal's foreign poli
that are contained in the platform of Measures approved by our Eighth Congress.

The PCP declares without qualification for close relations with the fratern
Communist parties of socialist and capitalist countries. It takes an active part in the worl
Communist movement and fights for its unity on the solid basis of Marxism-Leninisn
proletarian internationalism and respect for the standards of relations between broth
parties.

The PCP seeks close relations and active solidarity with the Mozambique Liberatio
Front, People's Movement for the Liberation of Angola, African Independence Party
Guinea and Cape Verde Islands, Movement for the Liberation of the Sao Tome an
Principe Islands and other national revolutionary parties and the forces of nation
liberation movements belonging to the peoples' broad anti-imperialist front.

We are as willing as ever to preserve relations of co-operation and mutual respect wit
all anti-fascist and democratic forces, with all Socialists and progressive Christia
interested in specific actions for peace, democracy, security, co-operation an
understanding among nations.

As a Communist, I consider it my duty to use every opportunity, such as, in particula
the publication of this article in a journal which has numerous readers all over the worl
for expressing sincere and deep gratitude to our foreign comrades and friends for the
solidarity with our revolution, the working class and the people of Portugal, th
democratic movement and our Party.

Some of those to whom these words are directed attended our Eighth Congress. Othe

who were our guests on other occasions had the opportunity to acquaint themselves ı detail with the situation in Portugal and with the activity of our Party and its individu members, of the working people of town and countryside. We feel certain that our friend have satisfied themselves:

—that the PCP is and will remain loyal to proletarian internationalism and the gre cause of liberation of the working people, of the oppressed and exploited poeples of th world;

—that by reaffirming its fundamental position in the bitter class struggle going on i Portugal, the PCP is proving its absolute independence.

The Communists of Portugal have been, are and always will be internationalists an patriots. They have shown this and will continue to show it by their activity. This is a ro we will never abandon, for it is leading to the future.

Defence of Peace Is Our Common Cause

A dialogue between a Communist and a Catholic

ROGER MAYER
France
IGNAAS LINDEMANS
Belgium

REPRESENTATIVES of many political convictions and ideological trends are toda active in the efforts to deepen detente and for effective disarmament. How do they mana to co-operate and why is it that a difference of viewpoints is not a hindrance t consolidation and co-ordination of the peace forces? These are the questions discussed b Communist Roger Mayer, member of the National Secretariat of the French Pea Movement, and Ignaas Lindemans, representing the Flemmish Catholic Pea Movement *Pax Christi,* head of the research services of the Belgian Confederation Christian Trade Unions. Both attended the World Conference to End the Arms Race, f Disarmament and Detente in Helsinki.

Different Roads to the Peace Movement

I. Lindemans. There are several reasons why I support the peace cause. For Christia striving for peace, just as for anyone else, it is most important to follow one's convictio Convictions must be formed, Christians say. There are things I learned from my father, volunteer in the First World War who returned home with the bitter truth of what he ha seen and experienced. He knew the price of peace and his children were able to learn fro him. My work also helped form my convictions: I sought objective explanations for su phenomena as war, preparations for war, arming and its acceleration into an arms rac And, finally, if believers carefully read the gospel and not just a few lines out of conte they will see that Christians must work for peace because only those can be happy wh stand up for justice and defend peace.

R. Mayer. The motives that brought me to the peace movement are similar to those th made me a Communist. I was in the Resistance Movement and after the Second Worl War, I was aware of the new weaponry being designed, so the concern for preserving pea became the very essence of my life. I learned a great deal from Frederic Joliot-Curie who assistant I was for many years. As the twentieth anniversary approaches of his death an

his 80th birthday, we should try to profit from his struggle and from his views on t problems of arms and disarmament. He had absolute faith in the future. What we a working for is a direct continuation of his work: I see how today we are successfu uniting different people and different movements which in his day were unable to fi common ground.

I. Lindemans. Indeed, the struggle against war, armaments, against the cold war, a military conflicts can and should be waged together with those with whom we may diff on other issues. Working for peace seems to bring closer together the interests of peo from differing economic systems, political trends and religions. My work in the Belgi and International committees for European Security and Co-operation, in the pea movement, my meetings with trade union representatives of the socialist countries, ha taught me how important it is for people to come to know each other, exchange views a discuss various problems. The modest experience I have gained over the years, of c operating with peace-fighters allow me to hold a very positive view of what our moveme has achieved.

R. Mayer. I could repeat a good deal of what you have said. War is a universal evil. barrier to war must be erected involving a maximum amount of people and political, tra union and religious forces. Advocates of war are fewer in number than peace fighters a it is our duty to stop all actions that could lead to a war. It is to our movement's credit th it has always sought to multiply its ranks, compare views and promote co-operation various public organisations to stop the instigators of war.

I. Lindemans. From my personal experience I believe that peace supporters ha common ground for their activities. The Belgian delegation to the 1973 World Congress Peace Forces in Moscow represented various political trends and tendencies and ma organisations, large and small. After the Congress a co-ordinating body was formed Belgium representing all peace trends and organisations. At the World Conference Helsinki the Belgian delegation consisted of Communists, Socialists and Christians ar we are absolutely frank on what we agreed or disagreed on.

R. Mayer. There still exist different views of our common task, and many prejudice The "cold war" psychology influencing a certain part of the public has yet to b neutralised. I believe, however, that the very fact that the Helsinki World Conference t End the Arms Race, for Disarmament and Detente was attended by delegations, many o which, like the Belgian delegation, consisted of Communists and Socialists, liberal believers and atheists, representatives of organisations of the World Federation of Trac Unions, the Christian trade union movemement and other large non-government organisation, all working together, shows that we have taken the correct road.

I. Lindemans. The only correct road, I would add.

Positive Changes in the World

I. Lindemans. In the past ten years, particularly since the meeting of the Ecumenica Council in Rome and the World Council of Churches in Geneva, a great deal has change among believers, in the moral sense. There is a growing awareness that it is no longe possible, nor permissible to tolerate such things as poverty, inequality, exploitation, th arms race, war, etc. I believe this is a promising sign. After all, Vietnam and Angola, wit their relatively small military potential, were able to counter aggression. This suggest that besides a purely military force, there exists another, social and moral force. Thi awareness is particularly apparent among the youth, who declare that war is not a solutio to problems and that many of them require above all a social approach.

R. Mayer. I agree that we must carefully study the lessons to be learned from the end o the war in Vietnam. What made it possible for the Vietnamese people to oppose th gigantic military might of the United States? It was not only armaments, although thei importance, the ability to use them, and the Vietnamese people's heroism should not b underestimated. World public opinion was a major factor preventing the United State from using its entire war arsenal. Public opinion in the United States and in many othe

countries—a moral factor, if you wish—tied the aggressor's hands. Besides imperialism' defeat in Vietnam, an important event was the recent Helsinki Conference on Europea Security and Co-operation. Capitalist governments were forced to acknowledge th existing European realities and affix their signatures to the Final Act. This in itself was a extremely positive factor for Europe and the people will see to it that the Helsink agreements are fulfilled.

I. Lindemans. Without going into further detail, I agree with the importance of th lessons to be learned from the Vietnam war and the results of the Helsinki Conferenc However, I have certain misgivings concerning another problem. As a result o decolonisation, new states have emerged—if I am not mistaken more than 140 states ar members of the United Nations—and incidents could be started of a cumulative, so to say nature. In other words, a local, limited conflict could expand into a larger conflict.

R. Mayer. I cannot entirely agree with that, for I think we should welcome th emergence of so many independent countries. It is undoubtedly a positive fact that mor and more countries are throwing off colonial rule. But this process can be continued onl by stopping the arms race, the greatest and most real danger to international relaxatio Arms stock-piling means war danger. The sale of arms is being used by the United State for instance, the largest imperialist power, to bring the emerging nations under its sway.

L. Lindemans. I have also given this a great deal of thought. The possibility is very rea of the widespread use of modern technical means for military purposes, in the newly independent states also. Such dangers have become a greater reality in the last ten years

R. Mayer. I repeat, however, that national independence in no way contradicts co operation and fulfilment of joint projects. On the contrary, the stronger the nationa independence of many countries, the greater the certainty of a lasting peace on earth

Differing Viewpoints are No Obstacle to United Action

R. Mayer. Obviously joint action by peace supporters becomes more effective as publ circles, notwithstanding ideological differences, mobilise support for a common strugg against, say the arms race. This means work must continue for mutual understandir between people holding differing views. We have learned to penetrate the secrets of matt but still cannot fathom the secrets of the brain, therefore only through personal contact only through language as a means of intercourse, through an exchange of ideas, throug meetings, can a mutual trust and respect be built. This is the only means of planning actic and drafting declarations to win over ever more people from all walks of life.

I. Lindemans. From the ideological point of view the tasks facing the peace forces a not simple, if the whole complex of political problems involved is taken into account. It not easy to draw up a common platform in some West European countries, particular where political parties cannot reach agreement on many crucial issues. Two of the larg parties in the FRG, for example, (judging by election results) are at opposite poles. Th positions on peace, disarmament and European co-operation can differ radically a confrontation here is, undoubtedly, dangerous. The situation is similar in many oth countries. There also exist ideologies preventing any joint action for peace, against war. is impossible to arrive at a common position with racism, for example, or with simil ideologies. But, speaking of Europe, I do not think that differing ideological trends a tendencies should be a hindrance to a dialogue and to joint action in the efforts for pea and disarmament. On the contrary, over the past decade there have been many su discussions on our continent.

It is important to hold more opinion discussion, bilateral and multilateral meetings various levels and on a wide range of problems and not confine ourselves to like-mind groups. We must seek a way out of such confinement. I remember once returning fro Moscow by plane when at the airport I noticed a rather boisterous group of young peop This was the Belgian handball team, on its way home from the Soviet Union. They we speaking in their dialect and had no idea I understood them. From what they said

gathered that about half the prejudices they came to Moscow with, had evaporated you see, just a handball competition can achieve a great deal.

R. Mayer. It seems to me that the Helsinki Final Act made it almost impossible fo Western governments to continue with their outdated legends about the "iron curt because trips have become more frequent and ties have expanded. This does not mean attempts should be made to reconcile differing ideologies. In our quest for a com platform we do not abandon our viewpoints, we allow for differences but remain firml our positions and popularise our views on such key issues as the defence of peace disarmament. Differences in ideology can neither be reconciled nor concealed and onl dealing with them openly it is possible to win over entire peoples to settling comı problems of vital importance to them. If a war breaks out after all not only ideoloı differences, life itself may vanish.

I. Lindemans. I agree with this approach to drawing up common political platforms to ideological differences. In spite of diverging viewpoints we must be united on s issues as preventing war with its unbelievable destruction, limitation of particularly le types of weaponry. This is our moral duty. This does not, however, do away ideological differences. We remain Communists, Socialists, Catholics, but unite in sett the vitally important problem of preserving the peace.

R. Mayer. Henry IV is quoted as saying: "Paris is well worth a Mass", thus hinting readiness to disregard ideological differences for the sake of regaining Paris.

Well, I believe that peace is far too important to be purchased at the price of suc Mass. I should not forfeit what I believe in for the sake of peace but, I would be prepa to fight for peace shoulder to shoulder with anyone adhering to a different ideology. were to yield and create the impression, for example, that I share all the convictions of friend Lindemans, then he might become suspicious of me. Confidence is born of comm action for the sake of a vitally important goal and a deep faith in the feasability of this gc

Remove Obstacles to Detente

R. Mayer. The very fact that diverse political organisations, parties and trade unic meet to thrash out such problems as detente and disarmament shows that, irrespective proposed solutions, sober-minded persons, aware of their responsibilities, are moved b resolve to arouse public action. In this respect much was accomplished by the Woı Congress of Peace Forces in Moscow which signalled a new stage in the struggle. If the did not exist the possibility of stopping the arms race and of effecting changes there, would be futile to gather for discussions. Our movement is strong and popular because does not aim to ensnare people for questionable gains. Anyone wishing to help in t efforts for peace is not coerced into doing more than he wishes to, or can do.

I. Lindemans. I believe the military-industrial complexes, multinational companies aı arms manufacturers are a much greater danger to international detente and its extensic to other continents, than our differences. It seems to me that among the public there a two reactions to such things as the arms race, rearming, weapons development, etc. On tl one hand they evoke fear, scepticism and a feeling of fatality. On the other, the convictic grows that something must be done, that this cannot continue. In the five years since tl International Committee on European Security was set up, noticeable progress has bee made in that sphere. I cannot say that there have been big changes in the Western medi but the process has started. It is apparent that today fewer people believe the shop-wor cold war propaganda, and the talk of "dangers" often heard from NATO circles. I can als say that today is less antagonism and suspicion in press coverage of peace conferences

R. Mayer. But I would add that though anti-Communist prejudices are less injuriou today than in the past, they are still a great strain on the nations. The news media carr anti-communist fabrications. Propaganda of war, racism, chauvinism and ant communism still prevent a great many people from joining the struggle for peace Evidently, preconceived negative notions about communism keep many representative of a number of political and ideological trends away from our conferences. I think tha

more than anything else, joint actions and mutual contacts can help to eradicate ant communist prejudices and promote the awareness that without Communists it i impossible to fight for peace and disarmament. In the French peace movement there ar many Catholics and priests, we have managed to co-operate with many Gaullists and eve with those hostile to communism.

I. Lindemans. My own observations confirm that the situation in Europe has change considerably over the last five to ten years. Many anti-communist prejudices hav disappeared. Relations between non-communists and Communists have improved i West European countries and between us and Communists in the socialist countries. W have been able to break through an unwillingness to discuss topical issues. Before, fo example, it was out of the question to organise discussions on such issues as the workin peoples' rule in factory management or improving labour conditions. Today, this is quit common and not only in the European countries that are ILO members. This fact seems t have psychological weight, for despite a certain increase in the anti-Communist counte offensive following the signing of the Final Act in Helsinki, the general public is no longe as susceptible to this as it was before. It is most important to look ahead, to be able t profit from these changes and from the progress made by peoples in the last 20, 15, even years, both in the socialist countries of Eastern Europe and in what are called the We European bourgeois countries. Objective conditions are on hand for abolishing anti communist prejudices.

R. Mayer. Nevertheless, we are often confronted with actions prompted by ant communism—actions ultimately directed against the peace and national independence c one or another country. I can recall a recent example when representatives of France, th USA, and West Germany, meeting in Puerto Rico, decided that in the event th governments in Italy and France, included Communists, "retaliatory" economic measure would be taken. This is not a matter of anti-communist prejudices. The real aim here is t encroach upon national independence and democratic rights under the pretext o combating Communist parties. I believe that both Communists and non-Communist alike cherish their national and social rights sufficiently to unite in the common struggl for national independence, social progress, peace and disarmament. And since the people have gained political experience, we can hope to overcome anti-communism and it consequences.

I. Lindemans. In the last five years all sections of society have realised, to a greater o lesser extent, the necessity of placing the defence of peace on a more positive an permanent basis, imparting a greater political meaning to it. It is important to sprea more information explaining the qualitatively new characteristic of today's arms race an the change in the very nature of war brought about by new technology and by th stockpiling of armaments.

R. Mayer. I agree that one means of increasing public opposition to the arms race is b broadening the campaign of information. The public knows too little about the rea dangers of the arms race, and is not convinced that it can be effectively countered. Fo decades, possibly for centuries, the majority has believed that military policies an international politics are beyond the influence of mere mortals. A good deal could b achieved if the great danger of the arms race was explained to the public and if they wer shown what they could do to help stop it.

I. Lindemans. Perhaps something like an East-West Press Agency should be set up i connection with the International Committee for Security and Co-operation in Europe The agency might have a small group of competent journalists from both capitalist an socialist countries, sincerely interested in problems of detente, disarmament, peace an co-operation in Europe. It would be their job not only to disseminate availabl news, but to correctly interpret it, to expose misleading and false information.

R. Mayer. I believe the foremost task of journalists is to respect facts, to publis authentic information only, shun falsification, and expound views correctly. They ca help overcome prejudices, and dispel the myth that arms production livens up th

economy as a whole by creating more jobs.

I. Lindemann. Yes, it is extremely important to convince the trade unions in Europe the whole world that despite their differences, they must co-operate and reach agreem on such issues as peace and disarmament. They must find an acceptable organisatio form which could help to achieve, at least in the peace and disarmament field, such operation as existed at the dawn and other stages of the trade union movement. Work peace, co-operation and concord helps one to gain a better understanding of the situat in other countries. I, for one, learned how the economy and democracy function in E European socialist countries, and about public activities there. Trade union functionai with whom I am acquainted have always returned from the Soviet Union, Pola Rumania and other socialist countries, firmly convinced that agreement could be reacl to settle the problem of peace. This helps develop the peace movement to an ext inconceivable twenty years ago. The strength of the movement lies in the fact that i based on observance of the independence and equality of all participants, on respect the views of others and contribution of each to the common cause.

R. Mayer. As for the Communists, they have always respected the opinions of other the peace movement and are determined to continue working with them, heeding th views and proposals and entrusting them their place and role in these efforts. When we that in the peace movement decisions are reached unanimously, that is exactly what mean. New-comers find their place in our movement, and they help others to do the sar I might be slightly over-optimistic, but it seems to me that this could serve as a starti point to consolidate and develop what had been achieved since the Moscow Wo Congress of Peace Forces.

Freedom of Choice, and the Choice of Freedom

JAMES ALDRIDGE
British writer

EVER since the signing of the Helsinki agreement, governments, press, intellectuals, s interested organisations and all sorts of groups in the West have been looking for so way they can use Helsinki to attack the socialist community. On the whole they h concentrated on two things. One is the problem of so-called "personal freedom", and other is the question of information and knowledge about each other's countries. In f these two are related in many ways. The whole question of what we know about each otl has always been used by the West as an example of how limited the socialist communit in its understanding of the West, and therefore how limited their freedoms. Whereas West is supposed to understand everything about the socialist world. Our press repo everything that is going on there in a perfectly "free" way. And, of course, this considered an example of our kind of "freedom".

That is the picture. But how true is it?

As a writer, for instance, I am keenly interested in how much any country knows ab our English literature and our contemporary writing. I like to know how many boc other countries translate from English. How many books we translate from otl languages. How many foreign plays and poets we know about. How many of c contemporary writers are known abroad.

If one asks these questions in an Anglo-Soviet context the answers, unfortunate prove that we in the West are so ignorant of Soviet literature and contemporary writi that we can hardly claim to know anything at all about Soviet life. Whereas if you look

the figures of what the Soviet Union does about *our* literature and contemporary writing they can justifiably claim that they not only know more about us than we do about them but that sometimes they may even know more about aspects of our literature than many o us know ourselves.

Since the war, the Soviet Union has published 4,500 books by British authors, and th total number of copies circulated is over one hundred million. That does not includ American authors, which would add another 7,000 books published in more than thre hundred million copies.

If you widen this kind of information a little, the situation becomes even mor astounding. Last year 129 Soviet theatres were staging Western plays. Performers from abroad gave more than six thousand concerts in 92 Soviet towns in 1975. In the last te years the USSR has bought 61 American feature films. In fact every year the Soviet Unio buys about 50 to 60 Western-made feature films, and a large number of TV programme Finally, you get the astonishing figure that 12 million people in the Soviet Union ar studying English, and 11 million are studying German and 2.5 million are studyin French.

I would not have bothered with all these facts and figures, but the contrary facts are s abysmal that you can hardly find any evidence at all of Soviet writers being translated i English or any other language. A few are translated, but the difference in numbers o copies is astronomically in favour of the Soviet Union. How many Soviet plays hav Western audiences seen? How many Soviet films? How many genuine Soviet authors ar known, and how many people in England are studying Russian? A thousand? Te Thousand? Nothing like an equal proportion of 12 million. And what is true of Britain i true of France, Germany, Italy, etc.

Take it a little further. One journal alone in the Soviet Union, the *Innostranay Literatura* (Foreign Literature), has a formidable list of Western writers to its credit William Faulkner, Ernest Hemingway, Erskine Caldwell, John Steinbeck, John Cheever Truman Capote, J. D. Salinger, Thomas Wolfe, Scott Fitzgerald, Kurt Vonnegut, Gor Vidal, Lillian Hellman, Tennessee Williams, Arthur Miller, Edward Albee, Jame Baldwin, John O'Hara, T. S. Eliot, C. P. Snow, William Golding, Louis Aragon, Graham Greene, Evelyn Waugh, John Wain, Alan Sillitoe, Sid Chaplin, Doris Lessing, Iri Murdoch, Simenon, James Joyce, J. P. Chabrol, Andre Maurois, Francoise Sagan Natalie Sarraute, Bazin, Gunter Grass, Erich Maria Remarque, Boll, Durenmatt Moravia, Pratolini, Pavese, etc, etc.

Show me a list of Soviet writers published in the West to compare with that list, and shall say that our Western world knows something about Soviet life and Soviet literatur and Soviet culture.

I had no intention when I started writing this article of going into this question in suc detail, but the situation is typical of the imbalance that curses East-West relations. Th perpetuation of the lie that the socialist community is ignorant and therefore "unfree" continues even in the face of all the evidence to the contrary.

If it happens in literature it also happens in other areas of culture and information, i the scientific community, in every area of the famous Basket Three of the Helsink agreement. The pretence that the West is uniquely better equipped to know what is best fo the world, because it is uniquely better informed and uniquely better cultured an uniquely more "free" is as ridiculous in its prospects as that old dream of destroying th socialist community by isolation or war.

But despite these attempts to reverse the truth about the socialist community, th balance of popular opinion in all Western countries is nonetheless in favour of detent with it, and this cannot be hidden. Moreover, intelligent politicians, even those who ar fundamentally anti-socialist, realise that there is no way out but detente. That is why man of them accept Helsinki, even while they try to use Helsinki to discredit the socialist ide and divert a lot of attention from the general crisis that settles over Western life like a fo from the Arctic.

o

In fact the wider aspects of Western diplomacy reflect the curious compromise which all Western societies have to make with their need to survive, while continuing their ruthless determination to remain capitalist and anti-communist—particularly in the face of a world crisis they cannot control. Every day we read in our press about the mess we are in. One day it is economic, the next day political, the next day moral, and the next day social. The crisis is not only too big to hide, the problem is too difficult to solve. So they have to be very careful.

The methods that capitalism has used in the past to solve its crises were militarism and war, reaction and racism. But that isn't so easy any more, because war now could mean quick self-destruction. Some of our right-wing gentlemen in the West are willing to take that risk, so there is a certain polarisation taking place, even among the conservative forces, between those who want to take their politics to the point of war, and those who reject the idea as suicidal.

We had an example of this at the recent Tory conference in Great Britain. Speaker after speaker got up in the conference to denounce detente and the Helsinki agreement. Some of them talked as if they wanted a quick march on Moscow. Finally, Mr. Reginald Maudling, the Tory Shadow Foreign Secretary, had to tell the conference that the only alternative to detente was the end of civilization. And though he was heard to the end, he was denounced from the floor of the conference. There were even cries for his resignation from the new young guard of the Conservative Party.

This sort of situation is not only concerned with detente. The same people who call for a return to the cold war in the West are the same people who call for the most drastic attacks on the level of life, and at the same time cry loudest that we have "true freedom" in the West, while there is no freedom at all in the East. There is nothing new in this. But what makes the situation different now is that there seems to be something final and decisive in what is happening.

The general tendency of the right to go even father right, and the inescapable fact that the working-class parties are steadily moving more to the left, is not just another variation in the political ups and downs of Western life. Inevitability is staring both sides in the face, and the situation that they face is a crisis which has no solution except a complete transformation of the economic and social foundation of Western society.

The right wing obviously want our society to go on moving to the right, ending inevitably in fascism. The left want it go more to the left, heading inevitably towards true socialism. And for those who haven't made up their mind which way to go, there is the present, nervous status quo, which is no more than a temporary compromise.

No serious political observer on either side believes that the present situation can last for long. Nor do most of the people who take up a middle position think they can hold the balance forever. The decisive issues of Western society are finally coming to a real choice, and every day now we are beginning to live with it. Moreover, it has its own logic. Mr. Harold MacMillan, former Tory Prime Minister and an elder statesman, said the other day on TV that he had never known a period when there was such animosity and bitterness between classes.

As for freedom: that too is becoming a choice. As we lose more and more of our hard-won social freedoms in the West, we are offered in exchange more and more highly individualist and anarchic "personal freedoms" which look good. But this whole question of "personal freedom" cannot be won or lost on the basis of appearances. Western society might look free, but it is being pushed into defending itself with restraining laws that take away many of our real freedoms.

And what is it that they are defending? One-third of Britain's total personal wealth is owned by one per cent of the population. About ten per cent own approximately seventy per cent of Britain's wealth. Property is what they are defending. It is being defended by cut-backs in the social services, education, housing, health. It is being defended by wage restraints, high prices and unemployment. And the more the fundamentals of our liberties are thus attacked in the name of law and order or economic necessity or solutions to a

crisis, the more we are left with the fragile shell of our private personality and the perfect freedom to do what we like as individuals.

In fact by sheer saturation of the personality we are destroying it in the name of liberty. Our spirit is being corrupted, and that too is an attack on our freedom. It is not for nothing that about 70 per cent of plays in our London theatres are pornographic to one degree or another—and that is not my opinion, but comes from some of our serious critics who deplore the situation. It isn't an accident that there is now so much violence in our cinema and TV that we grow accustomed to the sight of brutality, rape, sexual aberrations, police violence, ruthless self-interest, political corruption, and a belief that machiavellianism is a normal part of our lives. Trick or be tricked.

These are the lessons we are being taught as adults, just as surely as our children are taught that the Normans conquered Britain in 1066. In fact the same brutal attack on the underlying decencies of our social existence is directed more and more at the children, who are being saturated with violence, sometimes even before they can read and write properly.

This increase in our spiritual "unfreedom" is acknowledged day after day in Britain by our journals, our philosophers, our politicians, our priests. They know what is happening. They talk about it and write about it all the time. But they accept it as an indigestive process that is explained by those magic-words—"human failure." Rarely, if ever, do they carry their dismay to its logical conclusion that spiritual failure is part of our social failure. Society itself is developing these "unfreedoms", and that is where we have to look if we want to discover what this argument about "freedom" or "unfreedom" really is.

These are the dangers in the modern world. The whole basis of freedom is vastly different according to the society, and it becomes an ideological matter when there is a choice between them. The Western argument is that there should be no ideological frontiers, that the ideological frontiers should go down because the West's idea of freedom is "right", and the socialist idea of it is "wrong". That is quite implicit in the Western position, which in itself is an aggressive ideological stance. The socialist world is accused of defending its own ideology unfairly. Yet it is interesting to note that *The Times* of October 1, 1976, pointed out in another context that "in ideological conflicts, no one ever surrenders".

Perhaps nobody does surrender. But the Helsinki proposition, which was inspired by Soviet attitudes, is that even if there is an ideological difference, there is no need to go to war. Detente is a mark of confidence in keeping the peace, while the ideological struggle is settled by other means. The West implies that the increasing strength of socialist thinking in Western countries is a Soviet export. But the socialist idea was developed in the West long before there was a Soviet Union, and it is deep in our traditions. So the true ideological battle is not the Soviet Union versus the West, but simply what happens to society in every Western country.

If capitalism is good enough to solve our problems it will survive. If it isn't good enough it will fail and disappear. That is true of socialism also, and that is what the ideological battle is about. Detente gives us a chance to make the choice peacefully and without destroying mankind in the process. And, like many other people who are sportsmen at heart, I can only say of the contest: "May the best man win."

For the Right to Live Without Fear

(A Letter from Argentina)

POLITICAL violence took a toll of 1,300 lives last year during the terror campaign launched by the ultras, left and right, and as a result of official reprisals and the acts committed by clandestine armed groups.

In this situation the Argentine Human Rights League issued a solidarity appeal, pointing to a "possibility to achieve peace by defending life and the right to live without fear". The alarm caused by the massive escalation of violence and terror, the appeal says, is accompanied with "the growing painful concern the destiny of thousands of people arrested without trial, jail for indefinite terms and tortured. Their whereabouts are often unknown. So are the charges against them." The fate of the family "who search for those missing and do not know whether they are alive or not, whether they are arrested or massacred during unlawful reprisals", is nothing short of tragic. The situation described in the appeal is of great concern to the broad sections of the public, and most definitely, to the vast majority of the Argentinians, including even some members of the military government.

For this reason the appeal to solidarity, "raising the morale of those who denounce any terror and keep on fighting for democratic freedoms and human rights", is an expression of the patriotic sntiments of all who are out to stop the reign of reprisals in Argentina.

The League calls for solidarity in order to put an end to all terror, secure the release of those arrested without trial, the earliest hearing of the cases of persons under investigation, finding of the disappeared or kidnapped, punishment for those guilty of crimes and tortures. It calls for a fight for "an Argentina of peace, justice, freedom and security for all".

Numerous organisations, and also the Catholic Church, have approached the military government with a petition, asking for a release of the people detained without trial. During their meeting with the Minister of Labour representatives of the trade unions affiliated to the General Confederation of Labour insisted on the need to free the arrested trade union members and expressed concern over the way they are treated. International appeals of this kind, too, proved largely instrumental.

Late in 1976 the government announced that it had ordered the release of more than a thousand arrested as the first move in deciding the fate of those detained on similar charges (several thousand are still under arrest, according to various sources).

These facts are evidence of the potentialities of the democratic forces in Argentina in the face of a threat of a coup in the Pinochet fashion. They are also the result of solidarity, proving the effectiveness of the appeal issued by the Argentine Human Rights League.

Angel Gallardo

Spain— The Demand for a General Amnesty

THE road to freedom in Spain today passes through abolition of all the vestiges of Franco's terrorist system. The chief demands are general amnesty for political prisoners and exiles, repeal of all repressive laws, and dismantling of the emergency courts. All Spaniards want that, and a broad popular movement is unfolding across the country—from La Coruna to Barcelona and from Bilbao to Cadiz. The mass struggle

finds expression in strikes and demonstrations, but also in "voluntary imprisonment"—people lock themselves up in churches or factories, or go on hunger strikes, as an expression of protest.

In August 1976 the king and his second government were forced to concede a very limited amnesty that still left over 200 political prisoners behind bars. All the repressive laws were left intact, and the special courts continued to operate. Such workers' leaders and democrats as Marcelino Camacho and Sanchez Montero and many others were re-arrested. Therefore the movement for a general amnesty and for the right of all exiles without exception to return (this right was denied to Dolores Ibarruri, Santiago Carrillo and others) continued to gain momentum.

The arrest in Madrid last December of Santiago Carrillo, General Secretary of the Communist Party, and seven other Party leaders, who were brought to the Court of Public Order on charges of "illegal association" in a banned organisation, sharply added to the intensity of the struggle. Two hours after the arrests were made there was a protest demonstration of 2,000 in front of the Civilian Administration of Madrid Province. Another 4,000 demonstrated near the national security headquarters. Demonstrations took place in many towns but were brutally suppressed by the police. Immediately after the arrests the Communist Party leadership held a press conference at which it called for a fight-back and sent a protest letter to the offices of the head of government. Hence walls were covered with slogans and posters demanding the release of the detainees. All democratic opposition, even the most moderate, joined in the protest. Outside Spain the release of the arrested was demanded by numerous organisations, public figures and representatives of government circles.

As a result of this powerful campaign, the Spanish Communist leaders were freed on bail, eight days after the arrest. On the day of their release the government announced that it was abolishing the Court of Public Order.

This victory will give the Spanish people new strength in the fight for freedom. The victory was a clear demonstration of the efficacy of international solidarity, which unites the people and helps consolidate the democratic movement throughout the world.

P.A.

Madrid, January 1977

International Seminar in Delhi

AN international seminar on the role of the public sector in developing countries, co-sponsored by the Communist Party of India and *World Marxist Review*, was held last December in Delhi. It was attended by representatives of fraternal parties and scholars from India, the GDR, Iran, Iraq, Mongolia, the Soviet Union, Sri Lanka and Syria, and also a delegation from this journal. The delegates were greeted by Rajeshwara Rao, General Secretary of the National Council, Communist Party of India.

The items on the agenda included the role of the public sector and the class character of state power, relations of production in the public sector in countries of capitalist and socialist orientation, the public sector and big capital (local and foreign), the policy of the state towards different sectors of the economy, and efficiency criteria at state-run enterprises. The participants in the seminar defined the role of the public sector in the struggle waged by developing countries against neo-colonialism and for economic independence. Much stress was laid on democratising the public sector for the benefit of the working people and the public at large. The discussion also centred round the role of the working class in launching the democratisation. The economic, scientific, technological and cultural co-operation between socialist and developing countries,

aimed at promoting the economic independence of the latter, was highly acclaimed at the seminar.

In the communique the delegates said the seminar had proceeded in an atmosphere of fraternity and had proved productive.

A review of the seminar materials will be published in one of the coming issues of *World Marxist Review*.

The Press

Inspiring Example of Dedicated Service to Communist Ideals

MIKHAIL MCHEDLOV
Deputy Director, CC CPSU Institute of Marxism-Leninism

SOVIET Communists and the Soviet people at large, as well as progressives the world over, celebrated the 70th birthday of CPSU General Secretary Leonid Brezhnev. On this occasion the Political Literature Publishers issued a mass edition of the short biography of Leonid Brezhnev prepared by the CC CPSU Institute of Marxism-Leninism.

The life and work of this outstanding representative of the Soviet working class and people, a leader of the Leninist type, is presented against a broad historical background. Brezhnev's biography is closely linked with the heroic generation which, inspired by the ideals of the October Revolution, dedicated their efforts to creating the world's first socialist society. They built socialism, defended it in the battles of the Great Patriotic War and made impressive progress on the road to communism. The life of Leonid Brezhnev has been inseparable from the Leninist Party which made him a staunch continuer of the cause of the great Lenin.

The book brings out the main events in Brezhnev's life and work.

Leonid Ilyich Brezhnev was born into a worker's family on December 19, 1906, in the city of Kamenskoye, now Dneprodzerzhinsk (renamed in 1936), a large iron and steel centre in the Ukraine. For many years his grandfather and his father, also his sister and brothers worked at the local iron and steel plant. And it was at this plant that Leonid Brezhnev began his working life, his introduction to the turbulent and eventful career that was to follow. "The work at the plant," he recalled, "the thoughts and aspirations of the workers and their attitude to life largely shaped my world outlook. What I acquired then, has remained to this day."

The start of Brezhnev's working career coincided with the early years of the Soviet State. The Biography draws on numerous facts and historical documents to show how the generation of builders of socialism—Leonid Brezhnev among them—was maturing in those years. The education of young people in that period, the book says, was largely influenced by revolutionary enthusiasm and optimism which encouraged the working class and all other working people in building the new life. They were educated and ideologically tempered by the Communist Party. And, guided by the Party, they overcame the difficulties of the first years of socialist development. Lenin once said that it is in combating difficulties that ideological convictions take hold of people's minds, and this helps consolidate the gains of the revolution. Inspired by the enthusiasm of those heroic days, Leonid Brezhnev joined the Young Communist League at the age of 17. In 1929 he became a candidate member, and in 1931 a full member, of the Party whose cause, the cause of communism, he has faithfully served ever since.

Leonid Ilyich Brezhnev. Short Biography. Political Literature Publishers, Moscow, 1976. 144 pp., illustrated.

The book brings back the grim days of the Great Patriotic War. Responding to the call of the Communist Party, the Soviet people rose to the sacred struggle against the fascist invaders. In line with Lenin's teachings on the defence of the socialist homeland, the Communist Party turned the country into a vast fighting unit. The Central Committee of the Party and the government launched a sweeping programme to meet the country's war needs and mobilise its people to defeat the army. At that time Leonid Brezhnev was Defence-Industry Secretary of the Dnepropetrovsk Regional Party Committee. He devoted all his knowledge and abilities to the development of that important industry.

In the first days of the war Leonid Brezhnev asked the Central Committee to be sent to the front. Following a decision of the CPSU Central Committee, many outstanding Party functionaries, alternate members and members of the Central Committee among them, were sent to the armed forces. Almost one-third of the Central Committee, many secretaries of the Communist parties of the constituent Soviet republics, and heads of regional Party committees joined the army in the field. Leonid Brezhnev was among them. "I passed thousands of kilometres along the flaming roads of war, from its first day to the last," Brezhnev recalled. Citing historial documents, the book traces that heroic path.

The book also records many glorious pages in the history of the Great Patriotic War associated with Brezhnev, who had an active part in planning and carrying through a number of major operations in the Caucasus, the Black Sea area, the Crimea and the Ukraine, and in the liberating advance beyond the Soviet frontiers. (p.13). He was deputy chief of the political department of the Southern Front, headed the political section of the 18th Army and the political department of the Fourth Ukrainian Front.

The Biography quotes war veterans who fought together with Leonid Brezhnev for the freedom and independence of the socialist homeland. His words and deeds, courage and self-control, ideological conviction and staunch Party loyalty inspired the troops to new acts of heroism. During the great liberating advance of the Soviet Army, Leonid Brezhnev, then head of political departments at army and front level, participated in the liberation of Czechoslovakia, Poland and Hungary. When the most exhausting and cruel of all the wars our country had fought ended, Leonid Brezhnev was among those who marched in the Victory Parade through Moscow's Red Square, as Commissar of the regiment representing the Fourth Ukrainian Front: he had splendidly discharged his duty of Communist and soldier.

In the postwar years the Party sent Brezhnev to regions most in need of rehabilitation of the war-ravaged economy.

Leonid Brezhnev worked with devotion and perseverance as First Secretary of the Zaporozhye Regional Committee (Communist Party of the Ukraine), First Secretary of the Dnepropetrovsk Regional Party Committee, and First Secretary of the Communist Party of Moldavia. In October 1952, the 19th Congress of the CPSU elected him to the Central Committee which, at its plenary meeting, elected him an alternate member of the Presidium and Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee.

In the fifties the country launched an intensive campaign to boost grain production. The opening up of the virgin and fallow lands, which started at that time, has gone down in the history of the Soviet Union as one of its brightest chapters. The Party sent Brezhnev to Kazakhstan, the largest virgin-land area. In February 1954 he was elected Second, and in August 1955 the First, Secretary of the Central Committee of Kazakhstan's Communist Party. All who worked together with Leonid Brezhnev in those years share the opinion that he put his heart and soul into that nation-wide drive. When difficult important problems had to be solved, Leonid Brezhnev would invariably display the staunchness of a Bolshevik, clearness of purpose, persistence, and ability to grasp a difficult situation and pool the efforts of thousands of people (p. 46).

Other facts cited in the book are evidence of Brezhnev's vigorous activity as a political leader and statesman when he was President of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet. His election to that post in may 1960 meant a nationwide recognition of his services and immense prestige.

The October 1964 plenary meeting of the CPSU Central Committee was a landmark in the history of the Party and the country. At that meeting Leonid Brezhnev was elected First Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee. In that high post, the book says, he proved an efficient Party leader and mass organiser, an outstanding political leader of the Leninist type. With his experience and knowledge of the theory and practice of communist construction, Leonid Brezhnev made an immense contribution to charting and implementing the CPSU general line, to the Party's creative development of Marxism-Leninism and to the Leninist standards of Party and state activity. He concentrated on the main aspects of Party and state activity, raising the USSR's economic potential and the people's living standards, building up the country's military capacity, strengthening the socialist world system, uniting the international Communist and working-class movement and safeguarding peace and security of the peoples (p. 52)..

The Marxist-Leninist theory of socialism as the first phase of the communist social and economic structure has been further developed in Party documents and in speeches by Leonid Brezhnev. They outline the ways of building the material and technical basis of communism, the ways along which socialist social relations grow into communist relations, and also the ways of moulding the new man. They describe the main features of the socialist way of life and the objective regularities governing the building of communism. They set out the principles of improving economic management and all social processes at the present stage.

The 25th Congress of the CPSU was a historical milestone on the Soviet people's road to communism. The Report of the CPSU Central Committee on the Immediate Tasks of the Party in Home and Foreign Policy, delivered at the Congress by Leonid Brezhnev, enriched scientific communism. The Report set the key tasks of social development in time, the tasks of building socialism and communism, and pointed out the ways of accomplishing them. It gave a Marxist-Leninist analysis of the laws governing the world revolutionary process and international relations. The Report, imbued with revolutionary optimism and composed in a business-like manner, is distinguished for its class and Party approach to assessment of the complex phenomena of social life and the pressing problems of building communism, of the struggle for peace and freedom of the nations (p.70).

The book describes the indefatigable and fruitful activity of CPSU General Secretary Leonid Brezhnev on the international scene. He was appointed head of the CPSU Central Committee at a time when the sphere of the Party's foreign-policy activity had largely extended. As General Secretary of the Central Committee, Leonid Brezhnev made an outstanding personal contribution to the elaboration and implementation of Soviet foreign policy by the CPSU and its Central Committee, to strengthening the positions of the USSR and the socialist community as a whole, to ensuring lasting peace and security and the freedom and independence of the peoples.

The facts prove, the book says, that the Peace Programme, proclaimed by the General Secretary at the 24th CPSU Congress in 1971, was of truly historic importance for the destinies of mankind. Another outstanding event was the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe. Held in July 1975 on the initiative of socialist countries, it was a political and diplomatic forum, the largest in European history, of representatives of states with differing social systems.

The Soviet delegation was headed by Leonid Brezhnev. His speech at Helsinki had a tremendous appeal in mustering support for peace and international security.

At the 25th Congress of the CPSU Leonid Brezhnev analysed the new conditions of international development and put forward a programme of continued effort for peace and international co-operation, freedom and independence of the peoples. Its new proposals, which continue and develop the Peace Programme, were welcomed by the Party, the Soviet people, leaders of the Communist, working-class and national-liberation movements, and peace champions the world over (p.127).

In his speeches and reports, the CPSU General Secretary analyses the role of socialist

states in the world of today and the objective factors that determine the growing unity of the socialist countries. In line with CPSU policy, Brezhnev and other members of the Central Committee and its Politburo, are working to strengthen the socialist community and increase its influence on the course of world development.

The book cites data on the Soviet Union's support of the newly-emergent states and its assistance in their economic and social advance. This follows from the very nature of the Soviet social and state system and the principles of proletarian internationalism that are basic to the Party's foreign-policy activity.

Developing Lenin's ideas of the alliance of the socialist forces with nations defending their independence, the CPSU Central Committee, and Leonid Brezhnev personally, attach special importance to the all-round strengthening of the USSR's friendship and co-operation with countries that have taken the road of non-capitalist development and are the advance detachment of the national-liberation movement. The relations of friendship between the USSR and the newly-free states are exerting a positive influence on world development and help strengthen the forces of peace, democracy and socialism.

The CPSU, its Central Committee and General Secretary, the book says, keep in focus the problems of the world Communist movement and base their relations with the fraternal parties on the principles of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism.

In 1976 Leonid Brezhnev took part in the Berlin Conference of the Communist and Workers' Parties of Europe. Its outcome met with wide response in every part of the world. Leonid Brezhnev's Berlin speech was regarded as having major theoretical and practical implications. The forum of Europe's Communists pointed to the organic link between the drive for peace, security, national independence and democracy, on the one hand, and the basic goals of the fight for social progress and socialism, on the other.

The book cites typical examples of Brezhnev's energy and initiative, in his theoretical, political and organisational activities. His concern for the people and for peace have won him the respect of the Communists. The Soviet people, and of honest-minded men everywhere.

Throughout his career from steelworker to CPSU General Secretary, the Biography says, Leonid Brezhnev has always lived up to the great title of a Communist Party *member, justified the Party's confidence and has consistently promoted its noble cause* and worked for the triumph of Communist ideals (p.141).

He devotes all his immense experience, his knowledge and abilities to servicing the people, accomplishing the tasks of communist construction, and promoting the cause of peace and social progress. The Soviet people, the Biography says in conclusion, pay a high tribute of respect and gratitude to the Central Committee, the General Staff of the CPSU headed by Leonid Brezhnev, the loyal and staunch Leninist, dedicated fighter for peace and communism.

On his 70th birthday, the CPSU Central Committee, the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet and the Council of Ministers of the USSR warmly congratulated Leonid Brezhnev, true son of the Soviet people, leader of the Communist Party and of the Soviet state, outstanding figure in the international Communist movement, dedicated fighter for peace and social progress and consistent Marxist-Leninist. The message of congratulations addressed to Leonid Brezhnev says that his tireless and fruitful activity exemplifies selfless service to the Motherland, the Leninist Party and the Communist cause.

The Soviet people see in the Communist Party their tried and tested leader, the organiser of all their victories. They are convinced again and again that the policy pursued by the Party is a Leninist policy, that the CPSU is confidently leading them along the only correct road, the Leninist road to communism.

Landmarks in the History of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia

Prehled dejin KSC, Svobada, Praha 1975—pripravily Ustav marxismu-leninismu UV KSC a Ustav marxismu-leninismu UV KSS

REVOLUTIONARY history has always been an arena of sharp ideological struggle. And it was no accident that in the 60s the rightists falsified the history of the CPCz in furtherance of their anti-Party and anti-socialist aims and in their attempts to liquidate the CPCz and write finis to socialism in Czechoslovakia.

The 14th Party Congress set our historiographers the task of purging Party history of revisionist distortions and falsifications. That is the purpose of this book, "Survey of CPCz History", put out by Svoboda Publishers. It deals with the main aspects and forms of Party activity and assesses the main events and stages in its 55 years' history. The authors have drawn on, and in a number of cases critically analysed, earlier studies on the subject.

The Communist Party, the revolutionary vanguard of the Czechoslovak proletariat, was founded in 1921 in the post-war revolutionary tide and under the impact of the Great October Socialist Revolution. At the same time, the Party's rise in the mainstream of the world revolutionary process, was the result of the social development of Czechia and Slovakia, the upsurge of the revolutionary democratic and national-liberation movement, and of the workers' class struggle. The programme adopted by the young Party signified a break with Social-Democratic reformism. But, as the Survey emphasises, it was only after a hard-fought struggle for the Party's Bolshevisation, the assimilation of Marxism-Leninism and its creative application in capitalist Czechoslovakia, and due to active work in the masses, that the CPCz became a real revolutionary party of the Leninist type. With its 5th Congress (1929) the Party entered a period of political maturity, and under the Gottwald leadership, led our peoples to victory over the bourgeoisie.

With the mounting danger of nazi aggression, the Party constantly followed the united popular front policy worked out at the 7th Comintern Congress and devoted its energy to defending democracy and the republic against the menace of German fascism. The correctness of that policy was confirmed during the national-liberation struggle. The Party was able to form a broad anti-fascist national front and direct its fight for national liberation and, later, in liberated Czechoslovakia, for revolutionary-democratic transformations.

This Survey shows how the Communist Party, creatively applying Lenin's theory of socialist revolution, directed the process of revolutionary peaceful transition from national-democratic to socialist revolution, which culminated in the February 1948 victory of the working people over bourgeois reaction. People's democracy thus grew into dictatorship of the proletariat, our main lever in building socialism with the disinterested and comprehensive assistance of the CPSU and the Soviet Union.

The international significance of Lenin's theory of building socialism, the Survey notes, was confirmed in an industrial country, in Czechoslovakia. Our Party learned from its own experience that the best guarantee of building socialism is loyalty to Marxism-Leninism and the ability creatively to apply in Czechoslovak conditions the experience of the international Communist and workers' movement, notably that of its vanguard, the CPSU. The events of 1968-69 showed that any departure from Marxist-Leninist principles is fraught with serious negative consequences for the Party and socialist society as a whole, jeopardises the revolutionary gains of the people and the interests of the international working class. The record of this period is added proof of the need for the revolutionary working-class party consistently to combat opportunism and reformism, and also dogmatism and left sectarianism within its ranks.

The Survey emphasises that developments after April 1969 were a test for the Party, and it passed it, having purged its ranks of right opportunists and revisionists and having rescued the country from the crisis situation. The Party leadership, headed by Gustav Husak, restored the Party's revolutionary character, regenerated its activities, assured the proper functioning of government departments and the National Front on the principles of Marxism-Leninism and socialist internationalism, re-established our international alliances and directed the people's efforts towards new frontiers in building socialism. The 14th Party Congress was an important landmark in the development of socialist Czechoslovakia. It marked the end of one of the most complicated periods in the Party's history and worked out a programme of continued all-round building of socialism.

At its 15th Congress the Party, now united and strong ideologically, politically and organisationally, set new far-reaching aims in building a developed socialist society. "By our work today," Gustav Husak told the Congress, "we are continuing the revolutionary traditions of our Party, of the national-liberation struggle and the glorious February victory. The years since the 14th Congress and our present-day life have seen an advance along this path of struggles and victories."

Ladislav Novotny
Director of the CC CPCz Institute of
Marxism-Leninism

The Example and Experience of Recabarren

Carlos Contreras-Labarca, *Recabarren. Boceto de su vida y su obra.* Berlin, 1976. 50 pp.

ONE of the most noteworthy publications on the centenary of the birth of Luis Emilio Recabarren, founder of Chile's Communist Party and class trade union organisation, is *Recabarren: Notes on His Life and Work* by C. C. Labarca, a continuator of Recabarren's revolutionary work.

Recabarren's decisive role in the founding of a political party of the Chilean working class holds a special place in his vast contribution to the Chilean popular movement. As far back as 1908, drawing lessons from the authorities' brutal repressive measures against the saltpetre miners and their families in Iquique's St. Mary School, Recabarren came to the conclusion that to achieve success in the mass struggle, the working class needed "a powerful organisation . . . in the economic, political and co-operative spheres in order to replace the present society with a more rational one" (p.24).

An indefatigable worker who was always among the masses, Recabarren made a personal contribution to the early formation of cells of the future party in large industrial centres, particularly among the saltpetre miners. The party was formally constituted on June 4, 1912, on the premises of the Iquique newspaper *El Despertar de los Trabajadores,*[1] undoubtedly the most important of the many papers founded and edited by Recabarren. From then on, the Socialist Workers Party (SWP)[2] had deep roots among the Chilean proletariat, which left an indelible impression on it.

Consistent internationalism was a distinguishing feature of the SWP and its founder, Recabarren. It expressed itself more forcefully than ever in the attitude to World War I and the unqualified support for the October Revolution in Russia, which had strong repercussions in Chile and throughout the world and hastened the formation of working-class vanguards. "Soviet power," wrote Recabarren late in 1917, "has been in existence for slightly more than a month but we can say already that in this brief period it has advanced by more than 100 years. . . . The dreams or utopias of the 'visionaries' known as Socialists are becoming both a reality and a source of all progress and human happiness, and this is what has frightened the capitalist class in Russia and everywhere else most of all" (p. 39).

A consistently proletarian internationalist, Recabarren realised the inseparable connection between the victorious revolution accomplished in Russia on November 7, 1917, and the struggle of other peoples oppressed by imperialism. "We must side with our Russian brothers or we will find ourselves on the side of our oppressors," he pointed out. (p. 40). This thesis predetermined the Chilean Communists' invariable line, according to which the attitude to the Soviet Union is the central issue of their internationalism.

Recabarren was well aware of the need for the SWP to go over to a higher phase of ideological and political development and transform itself into a Communist Party. "The fighting methods used in the advanced working-class movement so far," he wrote in 1921, "need to be reoriented. On the new revolutionary road which the movement must take, it is indispensable . . . to evolve dependable methods and review our cadres and programmes" (p. 43). Early in 1922, the Fourth Congress renamed the SWP the Communist Party (after almost ten years of existence throughout which it had been led by Recabarren). This had many interesting aspects that are undoubtedly indicative of Recabarren's lessons and experience.

The most typical way of founding a Communist Party in those years was for the more advanced and consistent Socialists to withdraw from and break with the Socialist or Social Democratic party of the given country. In Chile, however, the SWP as a whole was a political organisation which gave rise to a new party. This was made possible by the high degree of its membership's class consciousness, the internationalist character of the SWP and its predominantly proletarian composition. There are close bonds of continuity between the two parties. At the same time, the founding of a genuinely Leninist Communist party in Chile constituted a qualitative leap in the progress of the working-class movement.

Recabarren was an outstanding organiser, propagandist and educator. Great credit is due to him for the development of the Chilean working-class movement, and as for his ideological legacy, it is still valid as a permanent source of inspiration to Chile's Communists. One of his precepts, which is now more important to Chile than ever, is that we must always work among the masses whatever the difficulties, must be among the masses and fight for them against the class enemy's influence. Acting on this principle, Recabarren ensured that the Workers' Federation of Chile, led by the reactionary Conservative Party, rid itself of the latter's tutelage, adopted a class position and eventually joined the Read International of Labour Unions.

Now that there is a fascist dictatorship in Chile and the paramount task is to bring about the unity of all anti-fascist forces, Recabarren's life and work are an inexhaustible treasury of experience.

Hugo Fazio

---

[1] "The Awakening of the Working People".—*Ed.*

[2] The first proletarian party of Chile, founded by Recabarren in June 1912. It was reorganised into the Communist Party of Chile in January 1922—*Ed.*

Temptation by Fear

On Jean-Francois Revel's *The Totalitarian Temptation*

JEAN-FRANCOIS REVEL, political commentator of *L'Express*, has published *The Totalitarian Temptation*, a book promptly lauded by the capitalist press.[1] *The International Herald Tribune* called it "the political literary event of the year." *L'Express* devoted a special issue to it printed in a million copies. *Time* magazine carried a lengthy review in its editorial comment section. "This book," wrote *L'Expresso*, the Italian weekly, without a hint of humour, "may, in fact, be described as one of the last geese saving the Rome of liberalism."[2]

The capitalist press campaign has a definite purpose and deserves a closer look.

Revel does not have to be introduced to those who have read his *Without Marx or Jesus*. He is an enemy of socialism and defender of the ideas of the "Atlantic community". Praising the book, *Time* wrote: "In 1971, when anti-Americanism was a favourite French salon game.... Revel audaciously argued ... that the US was the last hope for genuine world revolution...."[3]

This time too, Revel maintains what is likely to earn him the applause of reaction. It is not capitalism but communism that endangers progress, freedom and democracy, he writes. And this is, in his view, what many liberals and "independent leftists" do not see. Never trust the Communists, he warns, never compromise or come to terms with them but combat and exose continuously "the totalitarian nature of their doctrine" (see pp. 41 and 47). Nor does Revel presume to scale theoretical heights. As one of those who translate anti-communist propositions into propaganda action, he shows little concern for serious arguments or logical proof. His is a different task and a different method. Stunning his reader with a strongly-worded statement, whetting his curiosity with a doubtful paradox, tailoring the history of Chile to suit his purpose, galvanising false reports of the right-wing press on events in Portugal are among the propaganda devices he uses so adroitly.

It is methods of this kind that are in keeping with Revel's undisguised political aims. His book, published shortly before the 22nd Congress of the French Communist Party, has since become a weapon in a vast anti-communist campaign designed above all to talk the "non-communist Left" (see pp. 177-215) out of their alliance with the Communists and set the democratic-minded masses against existing socialism.

The author's reasoning is simple enough, "The decisive point at issue," he writes, "is not merely to ascertain whether or not capitalism has shortcomings, but how similar they are to the shortcomings of present or past economic systems and how much more serious its shortcomings are in comparison with those of other economic systems" (pp. 185-186). And, addressing those whom he calls "left, pro-communist liberals", claiming they are "supporters of reconciling socialism with political democracy", Revel writes, "If you attempt judging capitalism by another, *as yet non-existent* economic system, then I agree that capitalist shortcomings and inconsistency could appear to be unbearable" (p. 186). "This, however, would mean comparing reality with a project, life with a hypothesis, the existing with the non-existent" (pp. 186-189).

In a similar manner Revel claims that it is impossible to compare, although for different reasons, capitalist and socialist society for, as distinct from a "free and democratic society" (for the author this means only capitalism), communism is a "totalitarian system" based on an "apparatus of coercion".

On these grounds Revel attacks existing socialism. His arguments, however, do not transcend the old and familiar anti-communist ideas. His semantic juggling of related words is an attempt to reduce the concept of the dictatorship of the proletariat to sheer violence or unlimited personal power. He arranges the history of socialism to his convenience, choosing arbitrarily the start of the era, and tries to prove that the contemporary practice of existing socialism has been nothing but a series of mistakes and shortcomings which, he alleges, constitute the essence of the dictatorship of the proletariat and the new social system as a whole. In all the 400 pages there is no mention of the true Marxist-Leninist content of the dictatorship of the proletariat, nor of its role as creator of a new society, nor of the role played by the class that exercises this dictatorship basing itself on all the achievements of the culture, science and technology of capitalism, a class with a psychological affinity to other working people, enjoying prestige among them and leading the peasants and all petty-bourgeois segments in general. (see Lenin, *Coll. Works*, Vol. 29, p. 389).

Revel resents the fact that the "non-communist Left" "abstain from any constructive criticism of communists" (p. 40). He accuses them of political blindness. "It is futile to imagine", he writes, "that communism could acquire the characteristics of a liberal and democratic society. After all, genuine socialism can exist only when social justice and

political democracy are developed simultaneously and it is precisely this," declares Revel, "that a socialist society lacks". "What good is a socialised economy," he laments, "when political authority remains monopolised?" (p. 16).

It is revealing that while speaking of the need to simultaneously develop social justice and political democracy, Revel would like the pluralistic western model (bourgeois democracy) to be accepted as the standard of political democracy and also insists that democratic societies in general should be judged solely by this standard as though the measure of social justice was not one of the basic principles of a democratic society. Naturally, he says nothing about why political democracy is necessary or that it would be meaningless without social justice. This is not surprising, for otherwise Revel would have had to acknowledge that western political democracy, for all its plurality, is a democracy confined within a dictatorship of money and that it preserves a social hierarchy and injustice, the poles of poverty and wealth, that it cannot guarantee the working people even the most elementary rights, such as the right to work.

However, while forcing bourgeois democracy upon the reader as an absolute criterion, Revel does not venture to compare the political democracy of the two systems, for he would then have to explain why bourgeois-democratic freedoms were regularly trampled upon and how it was possible to combine these freedoms with the intrusions of citizen's privacy (such as tapping telephone conversations and surveillance), unrestrained extremism (in several West European countries and the United States), the assassinations of political leaders (in the United States), the adoption of anti-democratic legislation (the job ban for progressives in the FRG).

Revel deals extensively with the problem of unity (split, to be more exact) of all democratic forces, warning the "non-communist Left" that the "temporary communist concessions to electoral blocs—verbal concessions, in fact—never affect either the methods of communism (whose victory, he predicts, would put an end to bloc allies and elections themselves), nor its practice" (p. 52). He completely ignores communist practice and the experience and history of the Soviet state, specifically, Lenin's suggestion that the left-wing Socialist Revolutionaries participate in the Soviet government.[4] Nor does Revel say anything about the widely known fact that in such socialist countries as Poland, the GDR, Bulgaria and Czechoslovakia, the Communist parties co-operate constantly and successfully with other parties representing the particular interests of diverse population groups.[5]

Intent on demonstrating that socialism is "unlawful" and "unnatural", Revel paints apocalyptical scenes of general chaos, social cataclisms and economic anarchy claiming this to be inevitable whenever society is reorganised on social principles. He goes so far as to blame Chile's Popular Unity government for the fascist coup, declaring that had Salvador Allende not sought socialism there would have been no coup. Yet he "modestly" avoids mentioning the role played in creating economic chaos in Chile and in the coup itself by domestic and foreign reaction, particularly the well-known operations by the multi-national ITT Company which conspired with the CIA and other US government agencies against the elected Popular Unity government.[6]

Such strange logic is explained by the fact that in the multi-nationals Revel sees the chief motor of progress and Western civilisation's salvation from crises and even a harbinger of a kind of socialist transformations. Revel's political face is fully exposed by the apologetics of the multinational corporations which, according to the *Nouvelle Observateur*, "... manufacture, sell, speculate, hire and fire all over the world...."[7]

The title "*The Totalitarian Temptation*, is apparently an attempt by Revel to impress upon the reader that the building of socialism leads directly and inevitably to totalitarianism. For this reason anyone viewing the achievements of existing socialism as a solution to social and economic problems, anyone joining an alliance with Communists, automatically becomes an apologist for the totalitarian system and surrenders to totalitarian temptation. The true pathos of his book, however, lies in the fact that by fanning anti-communist hysteria and creating a distorted picture of history and of the

truth about existing socialism, and fearful of the dangers to other democrats supposedly coming from an alliance with the Communists, Revel revives "... all the old French fears about the true face of Communism...."[8] However, the French are sufficiently familiar with their own history and one of its developments which prompted Karl Marx to note: "When the 'red spectre', continually conjured up and exorcised by the counter-revolutionaries, finally appears, it appears not with the Phrygian cap of anarchy on its head, but in the uniform of order, in *red breeches*" (Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, *Selected Works,* Vol. 1, p. 419).[9]

History has proved these words to be correct many times over. Now as in the past imperialist reaction has tried using the "Red danger" to discredit Communist ideals and socialist practice, speculating on the petty-bourgeois notions of "freedom" and "democracy" in an effort to damage and split the democratic forces. It also resorts to outright interference in the internal affairs of sovereign states and tries to exert pressure on leaders of the Social-Democratic and Socialist parties of a number of European countries and influence their relations with the Communists.

All this is a further reminder of the fact that the content of the present-day political and ideological struggle is by no means determined by the conflict between "totalitarianism" and a "free, pluralist society", but by the class struggle, by the class antithesis between the two social systems. "Anti-Communism," says the document approved by the Berlin Conference of Communist and Workers' parties, "has been and remains an instrument of imperialist and reactionary forces in their fight not only against the Communists, but against other democrats and democratic freedoms". And, irrespective of his intentions, this is what Revel's book actually illustrates.

M. Jurgens

---

[1] Jean-Francois Revel, *La Tentation Totalitaire.* Paris, Editions Robert Laffont, 1976. 372 pp.

[2] *International Herald Tribune,* January 24-25, 1976; *L'Express,* January 12-18, 1976; *Time,* February 2, 1976; *L'Expresso,* No. 4, 1976.

[3] *Time,* February 2, 1976, p. 5.

[4] Here is what the CC RSDLP said, for instance, in November 1917, in an appeal to all Party members and all working classes of Russia: "... it is a well-known fact that a few hours before the formation of a new government and before the list of its members was submitted to the Second All-Russian Congress of Soviets, the Central Committee of the Bolshevik party summoned three prominent members of the group of left SRs, Comrades Kamkov, Spiro and Karelin, to attend its meeting *and proposed to them* that they be members in the new government". It was not the Bolsheviks' fault that at first the Left SRs rejected their proposal to take part in the government, then joined it, but not for long. Shortly afterwards they renounced loyal co-operation and engaged in counter-revolutionary action. - *Ed.*

[5] Active on the political scene besides the Communist parties are: The United Peasant and Democratic parties in Poland, the Democratic Peasant, National Democratic, Liberal Democratic parties and Christian Democratic Union in the GDR, the Bulgarian Agricultural People's Union in Bulgaria, the Socialist, People's Slovak Renaissance and Slovak Freedom parties in Czechoslovakia. Revel and his like do not relish the fact that these parties do not oppose the Communist Party or socialism as a social system. However, this is a matter relating to the anti-communist dreams of its enemies and not to the problem of co-operation among diverse parties in socialist society.

[6] There was "... a close relationship between ITT and the CIA", wrote Senator Frank Church, "so intimate that it became virtually impossible to tell where the one began and the other left off."

[7] *Nouvelle Observateur,* October 15-21, 1973, p. 70.

[8] *Time,* February 2, 1976. p. 5.

[9] The ancient Phrygian cap was believed to be the emblem of liberation and was worn by the Jacobins during the French bourgeois revolution. Red breeches were worn by the French troops marking Louis Bonaparte's accession to power by shooting Parisians.—*Ed.*

Cultural Decadence Under Imperialism

Imperialismus und Kultur, Berlin, Dietz Verlag, 1975, 580 pp.

WITH the forces of progress and reaction, of socialism and capitalism, locked in historic confrontation, the ideological struggle centres on the key aspects of the life of society. One of these is culture, which in capitalist society is being increasingly geared to the task of preserving capitalism. In contrast, progressive democratic culture is developing in line with the growing prospects for building a new and humane society.

This book, "Imperialism and Culture", compiled by the CC SUPG Institute of Social Sciences, examines the laws governing cultural development under state-monopoly capitalism. The authors trace the development of German imperialist culture at the onset of the general crisis of capitalism, and draw a panoramic picture of the battle between ruling-class and progressive, democratic culture. They show that the junker-bourgeois character, aggressiveness and tendency to militarise all social life, those typical features of German imperialism, also affected the development of ruling-class culture, and imparted to it an openly reactionary and chauvinistic quality.

After the rout of fascism, the opportunities for anti-fascist, democratic development were not made full use of in West Germany. This pertains to culture as well. The main reason for this, the author says, was that the old social and economic relationships persisted there. Following the FRG's entry into NATO, the culture of the ruling classes was visibly Americanised. More, it became avowedly anti-communist, revanchist and nationalistic.

The book examines the mechanism operated by monopoly capital and the imperialist state, closely associated with it, to channelise the development of culture. The authors expose the bourgeois concepts designed to justify the reactionary cultural policy pursued in West Germany by big business and the political parties that serve it.

Modern imperialist culture is "subject to crises and decadence" (p. 317), and this trend is a sign of the general crisis of capitalism which has extended to all areas of social life: work, education, bourgeois art, etc. Imperialism has proved powerless to develop culture for the benefit of the whole of society.

Much of the book is devoted to development trends in democratic and socialist culture, whose influence has been growing in all countries, including the FRG. This process is stimulated by the working class and democratic, progressive intellectuals. The authors write: "Only by fighting capitalism can the working class secure any improvement, even a small one, of its social status. In this struggle it is shaping its own moral principles, ethnical views and cultural values, whose class content basically differs from the ideals of the ruling system, with its accent on adaptation and integration. These are the moral principles that underlie democratic and socialist culture today. They determine its anti-monopoly character, internationalism and its humanistic ideal" (p. 507).

The trends and elements of democratic and socialist culture are increasingly merging in the course of the struggle for democracy. And the crisis of imperialist culture stands out more glaring against this background. All this gives us fresh proof that only the revolutionary working class can offer an alternative to the decadence of bourgeois culture.

The numerous facts cited in the book give the reader an idea of the hard struggle the German Communist Party is carrying on in the cultural sphere.

"Imperialism and Culture" exposes the ideologists of imperialism in their attempts to present the capitalist system as a "society worthy of man", which makes the book an effective contribution to the ideological struggle.

Waltraut Dähne

It is More Than They Can Do

ACCORDING to a curious report carried by *Newsweek* late in 1976[1], American publishers who have made a lot of money out of books exposing the CIA's disgraceful activities[2] have switched, as if on orders, to books by former spies whitewashing that organisation. The authors include such CIA have-beens as Ray Cline, a former CIA deputy director and head of its intelligence-gathering operations, Peer de Silva, a retired CIA station chief in Europe and Asia, David Phillips, former head of the CIA's Latin American desk, and lastly, William Colby, the former CIA director. Some rank-and-file agents, too, are trying their hand at writing books. Certain of them, such as George Fill, have chosen the form of novel. It is safe to assume that film hits "based on the novel of the same name" and glorifying more James Bonds of Langley are on the way.

In a review of Ray Chine's book, *Secrets, Spies and Scholars*, the *Washington Post* said frankly that Cline's book is one of several coming-outs this year by a defender of the CIA. He portrayed the agency as having been unfairly attacked in the press and in various congressional inquiries launched during the past two years.[3]

The authors of books like the above want to make the reader believe that the CIA's past activities have by no means been disgraceful, for the agency has kept—or so they say—within the bounds of its statutes bar a few exceptions; and that secondly, the CIA today, following press criticism and investigations by authoritative committees, has completely stopped breaking rules in any way or exceeding its power.

To refute the first allegation, one has only to quote Taylor branch, the American commentator, who wrote in the *New York Times Magazine* (September 12, 1976) as follows: "Three separate investigations . . . showed that the CIA, in some 900 foreign interventions over the past two decades, has run secret wars around the globe and has clandestinely dominated foreign governments so thoroughly as to make them virtual client states".

But perhaps the CIA's illegal activities are really a thing of the past and the high-minded officials at Langley scrupulously respect their statutes? The act of aggression against Cuba committed by the CIA over a few months of 1976 show that this is not so.

Two pirate ships, sailing from Florida, attacked two Cuban fishing-boats, seriously damaged them and killed one of the fishermen. A bomb blast in the Cuban Embassy in Portugal killed two staff members, severely wounded several others and destroyed the building. An explosion caused considerable damage to the premises of Cuba's UN mission. During an attempt to kidnap the Cuban Consul in Merida, Mexico, a technical staff member of the National Fishing Institute was killed. In Argentina, two members of the Cuban Embassy were kidnapped. At a Jamaica airport, a bomb exploded in the baggage van before the baggage was loaded on a Cuban plane. Next day witnessed an explosion in the Barbados offices of the British West Indies Co., which represents the interests of Cuba's airlines in that country. A further explosion greatly damaged the offices of Cuban Airlines in Panama City. Lastly, an act of sabotage about a Cuban plane on its way from Barbados to Havana resulted in the death of 73 persons.

"Behind these facts is the CIA," said Fidel Castro at a funeral meeting in memory of the victims of the plane explosion. He pointed out that the CIA had planned and incited the hijacking of planes to use them against Cuba in the early years of the revolution, prepared for piratical raids on Cuba from foreign bases and resorted to a monstrous method of sabotage by blowing up a civilian plane in flight.

The CIA was behind the assassination of foreign leaders who did not suit it. The Cuban magazine *Bohemia* (November 19, 1976) reported that there is specific evidence of at least 20 attempts on Fidel Castro's life, made between 1960 and 1971.

Coded cables intercepted in Cuba of late show beyond all doubt that now as in the past, that agency goes on planning sabotage and assassinations, including attempts on the life

of the Cuban Premier. Fidel Castro was perfectly right in saying that "those who imagine the CIA has mended its ways, if only a little, following the exposure of its horrible deeds in the United States itself are very much mistaken".

This is also confirmed by numerous evidence of CIA subversion against other countries. In the autumn of 1976, CIA agents engineered in Panama City riots designed to provoke a government crisis, reduce the country to a state of chaos and divert it from its progressive policies.

In September 1976 Philip Agee, a former CIA officer, named eleven agents of that espionage centre who were operating against Jamaica disguised as staff members of the US Embassy. Somewhat earlier, he listed the names of CIA officers active in other Latin American countries, where they held prominent posts, in particular Luis Vargas Garmendia, Deputy Minister of the Interior of Uruguay, and General Amaury Prantl, head of that country's army intelligence service.

World opinion knew even before of the CIA's direct involvement in the Chilean fascist coup but now nobody can deny it even in Langley. A recent US Senate report on operations in Chile, in 1963-73 admits that in the 1970-73 period local CIA bodies obtained all current information needed in the event of a coup: lists of the persons to be arrested and of the civilian institutions and individuals to be protected, lists of the key government agencies that must be seized, and the government's emergency plans in case of a military rising.

In an interview with the Mexican magazine *Siempre*, Agee said that in Latin America the CIA "has been engaged day after day in efforts to support certain traditional political *forces and strike down others. This also applied to CIA activities in Asia, the Middle East* and Africa".

The *West African Pilot*, a Nigerian newspaper, notes that no matter where political intrigues are plotted, conspiracies against progressive regimes hatched or politicians assassinated, these crimes can all be traced to the CIA. The Ethiopian leadership had become one of its victims because it had set out to effect fundamental social and economic reforms meeting the people's interests. Quoting the Ethiopian press, the *West African Pilot* commented that the CIA was directly involved in the attempt to kill Mengistu Haile Mariam, First Vice-Chairman of the Provisional Military Administrative Council (PMAC) of Ethiopia, and in the subsequent assassination of Fikre Merid, special adviser to the PMAC.

A reactionary coup in Thailand early in October 1976 brought a pro-US military clique to power. "The military coup," *L'Humanite* (October 8, 1976) wrote, "was carefully prepared by the CIA, which informed sources say had spent about 65 million dollars during last April's elections to organise the assassination of militant democrats and back the three principal right-wing parties submitting to the military leaders' decisions.

Is the Communist daily biased? Well, the *New York Times*, which is certainly not Communist, wrote that CIA involvement in the Thai events was a comprehensive operation. In fact, it could not have been otherwise since to the US and Thai military, the abolition of US military bases in Thailand ordered by the democratic government and the establishment of good neighbourly relations with Vietnam, Laos and Kampuchea were unpardonable crimes.

Lest the reader should have the impression that the CIA treats the socialist countries of Europe with a delicacy that is not generally typical of it, let us recall a recent press conference held in Bratislava last November. Speaking at the conference, Marian Slamen, a Czechoslovak intelligence officer, presented a detailed account of CIA-directed subversive activities by emigre organisations against Czechoslovakia and other members of the socialist community.

A curious thing happened after Ray Cline's book had come out. James Angleton, a former CIA prominent, was piqued by what he described as a misrepresentation of operations he had led in the past and gave away what secret services prefer to keep silent on. He admitted that in 1956 the CIA had had emigre units trained in West Germany

under the direction of its agents for an invasion of Hungary, Poland, Rumania and Czechoslovakia. The units were led, according to Angleton, by a graduate of the Hapsburg Military Academy.

So much for the facts. As regards the overseas organisers of campaigns intended to rehabilitate the CIA, they can hardly improve the badly tarnished image of the present-day "knights of the cloak and dagger". Nor can the writings of one-time spies do anything about it.

Vladlen Kachanov

---

[1] November 8, 1976.

[2] For a commentary on CIA activities, see John Pittman, "Behind the Facade of US Democracy", in *WMR*, February 1976, pp. 6-9.

[3] *Washington Post*, November 19, 1976.

New Books

Blum, Otman, Prudlo, *Ausländer + Deutsche in Betrieb und Gesellschaft* (Foreigners and Germans in Industry and Society). Frankfurt am Main, Nachrichten-Verlagsgesellschaft, 1976. 289 pp.

This guide for foreign workers arriving in the FRG contains 100 questions and answers regarding living and working conditions and the possibilities of joint struggle by German and foreign workers for their rights, against unemployment and monopoly domination.

Alexandro Cabral. *Jose Marti e a revolucao cubana* (Jose Marti and the Cuban Revolution). Lisbon, Editorial "Avante!", 1976. 185 pp.

This book. published by "Avante!" in the Caminhos da Revolucao (Paths of the Revolution) series, tells about the life and work of the Cuban people's famous son, Jose Marti. Speaking highly of Marti's role in the Cuban revolutionary process, it notes that to this day his example inspires fighters for freedom and social progress in Latin American and elsewhere.

Jan Kovanda, *Latinska Amerika—kontinent v pohybu* (Latin America: A Continent on the March). Prague, Svoboda, 1976. 440 pp.

A monograph covering Latin American history from the Spanish conquest to our day. It gives a detailed description of the struggle for independence, against US monopoly power, and shows how the Communist parties of the continent build up the unity of the working class and other working people, of the forces of democracy and socialism.

Janusz Kuczynski, *Homo Creator. Wstep do dialektyki czlowieka* (Homo Creator: An Introduction to the Dialectics of Man). Warsaw, Ksiazka i Wiedza, 1976. 380 pp.

The first part of the book is concerned with the Marxist conception of social practice and creativity. Its second part presents the Marxist approach to the analysis of man's being as an individual and spells out the intricate problems of man's relations with his surroundings.

Giuseppe Chiarante, Aldo Tortorella, *Per la riforma universitaria* (For University Reform). Rome, Editori Riuniti, 1976. 95 pp.

The authors indicate ways and means of ending the crisis of higher education in Italy and set out the Communists' proposals to democratise curricula, end the shortage of premises, teaching aids and staffs and provide graduates with jobs.

B. Ligden, *BNMAU-yn gadaad khariltsaag khogzhuulekh talaar MAKHN-aas*

yaviulsan uil azhillagaa, 1945-1970 (MPRP Activity in Promoting the Foreign Policy of the MPR, 1945-1970). Ulan Bator, 1976. 180 pp.

The book deals with the more important lines of the international activity of the Mongolian People's Revolutionary Party and its policy of co-operating with other socialist countries and extending relations with non-socialist countries. It shows the Party's leading role and socialist Mongolia's active participation in the solution of international problems and in the maintenance of peace and security in Asia and other parts of the globe.

Die Arbeiterklasse der sozialistischen Gemeinschaft in den siebziger Jahren (The Working Class of the Socialist Community in the Seventies). Berlin, Dietz Verlag, 1976. 163 pp.

A monograph by a team of GDR scholars on a theoretically and politically topical subject—the brother parties' policy of increasing the leading role of the working class in building a developed socialist society. It depicts the parties' effort to bring the working people into the planning and management of social processes, reinforce the alliance between the working class and the co-operative peasantry, further socialist economic integration and strengthen the internationalist relations of the working class of socialist countries.

A. I. Titarenko, *Antiidei. Opyt sotsial'no-eticheskogo analiza* (Anti-ideas: An Outline of Socio-Ethical Analysis). Moscow, Politizdat, 1976. 400 pp.

A Soviet philosopher criticises reactionary bourgeois socio-ethical concepts extolling outspoken anti-humanism, hopelessness and scepticism in regard to the general trend of social progress and treating man with cynical hostility. Countering these "anti-ideas" with the Marxist world outlook, the author sets out a number of problems involving moral quests and discloses the maning of the concepts of good, justice, happiness and other moral values.

L'imperialisme francais aujourd'hui (French Imperialism Today). Paris, Editions sociales, 1976.

The book is based on an exchange of views sponsored by the Foreign Policy Department of the CC FCP. Participants in the exchange gave a definition of French imperialism, its development trends and the government's foreign policy and showed the goals which the Communists of France are pursuing.

Ikonomicheski mekhanizym na upravlenie na sotsialisticheskata ikonomicheska integratsia (The Economic Mechanism of Managing Socialist Economic Integration). Sofia, 1976.

A team of Bulgarian and Soviet analysts investigates the role of CMEA as well as of various international economic organisations of CMEA countries in promoting socialist economic integration, and looks into the process of convergence of national economic management systems.

The FRG Berufsverbote

Persecutions of democrats in the FRG under the "Berufsverbote" (job discriminations) regulations are often reported in the press. I would like to know when all this started in West Germany, how and against whom the Berufsverbote operates.

Khristo Mladenov, Sofia, Bulgaria

FOR five years now the FRG authorities have been discriminating against Communists and other democrats by applying to them the so-called Berufsverbote.

Early in 1972 the Brandt government adopted Regulations Regarding the Attitude to Anti-Constitutional Elements in State Employment, which says in part that persons involved in "anti-constitutional activities" shall be denied jobs in civil service. These regulations, supplemented by instructions issued by the Federal and State governments, are meant to counter the growth of democratic and anti-fascist forces. They are a gross violation of the FRG Constitution.

It will be recalled that the German Communist Party (GCP) and the Socialist German Young Workers were established as legal organisations in 1968, and Spartacus, the Marxist student league, was formed in 1971. And so, the Communist Party and Marxist youth organisations acquired legality for the first time since the banning of the Communist Party of Germany in 1956. Faced with their growing prestige in the factories and the universities, the class enemy resorted to "defensive" measures; hence the Berufsverbote.

Government employees, who make up nearly 20 per cent of the work force, are the first to be discriminated against for political reasons. Berufsverbote victims include Communists, Social-Democrats, liberals, anti-fascists, trade unionists and non-party people.

The numerous Berufsverbote trials have brought to light the existence of a police surveillance mechanism. Before employing a person, the management asks the police about the applicant's activities over the past few years. And if the police report that the applicant is "involved" in democratic activities, life membership in progressive legal parties or organisations or trade union activities, or if he, or she, made trips to the USSR or GDR, participated in anti-fascist demonstrations, rallies of solidarity with Chilean patriots and with democrats in other countries, etc., he stands no chance of getting the job. In many states there are "loyalty tests", with job-seeker closely questioned about his views and activities.

People from all walks of life—transport workers, postmen, teachers, university professors, lawyers, civil servants—have been persecuted for their progressive convictions. According to the Ministry of the Interior, over 800,000 were subjected to loyalty tests; 6,500 were summoned for political interrogation and 3,000 were denied jobs. Any Berufsverbote victim could justly complain to the UN about violation of human rights.

Here are but a few names of those discharged for "political" reasons. *Silvia Gingold*, teacher, *Rudi Roeder*, engine driver, *Jürgen Brammer*, 22, postal clerk—all three fired for GCP membership; *Wolfgang Schwank*, bank clerk, fired for selling the GCP newspaper *Unsere Zeit*; *Heiner Blasenbrei*, mining expert, was a leader of the Spartacus youth league; *Peter Weiss*, SPD, teacher, took part in the work of the "Freedom for Chile" solidarity committee; *Charlotte Niess*, SPD, member of the democratic lawyers' association which includes several Communists; *I. Riedler*, teacher—according to some newspapers he was "sentenced to life unemployment" and denied the right to teach for his part in the 1968

Easter parade against nuclear arms, an attempt to wreck a pre-election meeting of the neo-nazi NDP, and for a school-room discussion of Hitler's concentration camps.

The Berufsverbote affects not only for those barred from state employment, but also those who pass loyalty tests (the very fact of being subject to a test is registered in a dossier). The humiliating test procedure can last as long as 18 months. Throughout this period the tested person, left without job and earnings, is subjected to psychological pressure.

The anti-democratic practice of persecution for progressive views is encouraging mounting protest in the FRG. The anti-Berufsverbote campaign has been joined by nearly 350 civil initiative committees which include Communists, SDPG and FDPG members, trade unionists and members of youth and other organisations. The committees hold meetings, discussions and demonstrations in defence of civil rights. The Week of Struggle against the "regulations regarding radical elements", organised late in November 1976, was a success.

The attempts by the reactionaries to use the job ban to trigger off a new campaign of persecution of progressives are increasingly opposed by the public in the FRG and other countries.

Kurt Erlebach

Diary

KAROLY LIPKOVICS, representative of the Hungarian Socialist Workers' Party on the journal and member of its Editorial Board, attended the 18th Congress of the Communist Party of Israel.

At the 22nd Congress of the Communist Party of Luxembourg the journal was represented by Vladimir Shundeyev, Executive Editor and member of the Editorial Board.

Hugo Fazio, representative of the Communist Party of Chile on the journal, participated in celebrations marking the 50th anniversary of the Progressive Party of the Working People of Cyprus (AKEL). Comrade Fazio attended a meeting with AKEL General Secretary Ezekias Papaioannou.

Michele Rossi, representative of the Italian Communist Party on the journal and member of the Editorial Board, took part in the Emergency International Conference in Solidarity with the People of Cyprus and the Emergency International Conference in Solidarity with the Palestinian People and the Lebanese National Forces. Both were held in Athens on the initiative of the Organisation of Solidarity of the Peoples of Asia and Africa.

At the invitation of the Communist Party and Revolutionary Council of Cuba, a delegation of the journal, comprising Betty Sinclair, member of the Editorial Council and representative of the Communist Party of Ireland on the journal, and Viktor Gugushkin, department head of the journal, attended the celebrations of the 20th anniversary of the Revolutionary Armed Forces of Cuba and the first session of the National Assembly.

A delegation of the *World Marxist Review* Commission on Problems of the National-Liberation Movement in Latin America, comprising Alberto Kohen (Argentina), Pedro Vasquez (Paraguay), Alvaro Mosquera (Colombia) and Jose Soares (Brazil), attended an international colloquy sponsored by the Latin America Institute of Wilhelm Pieck University in Rostock, GDR.

English edition of
PROBLEMS OF PEACE AND SOCIALISM

Theoretical and Information Journal of Communist and Workers' Parties throughout the world

PUBLISHED IN PRAGUE WORKERS OF ALL LANDS UNITE

VOLUME 20 MARCH 1977 NO. 3

CONTENTS

PROBLEMS OF PEACE AND SOCIALISM

is also published in Arabic, Bengali, Bulgarian, Czech, Danish, Finnish, French, German, Greek, Hebrew, Hindi, Hungarian, Italian, Japanese, Malayalam, Mongolian, Norwegian, Persian, Polish, Portuguese, Punjabi, Romanian, Russian, Singhalese, Spanish, Swedish, Tamilnad, Turkish and Vietnamese.

Enquiries for subscriptions to any of these editions should be sent to Press Circulation Agency, Thakurova 3, 16616 Prague 6, Czechoslovakia.

Published by S. C. Easton, 16 King Street, London, W.C.2., and printed by Farleigh Press (T.U.) Ltd., Watford

Democratic Centralism in the Activity of the CPSU

GEIDAR ALIYEV

Alternate member of the Political Bureau, CC CPSU, First Secretary, CC Communist Party of Azerbaijan

CONTEMPORARY social development is characterised by the fast-growing influence of the Communist and Workers' parties in public life. The increasingly manifest gains of existing socialism add to the prestige of the ruling parties of the socialist countries. Sustained struggle for the fundamental interests of the masses has made the Communist parties of many capitalist and a number of developing countries an authoritative political force. They largely hold the political initiative and offer crisis-bound society a real alternative of development. *"The growth of the influence of Communist parties in the capitalist world,"* said L. I. Brezhnev, General Secretary of the CC CPSU, speaking to the 25th CPSU Congress, "is in auxpicious development of the past five years".[1] It is fair to say that the Communists assume responsibility for the destinies of their countries and the world.

This now confronts every party with difficult tasks in both the theoretical sphere and in organising the masses to fight for peace, democracy and socialism. Hence the Communists' special attention to problems of building and developing their party. One of the most important questions they discuss in this connection is the significance and application of the principle of democratic centralism in specific conditions.

The 25th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union came to the conclusion that the dynamic progress of Soviet society, the growing scale of communist construction, and the international activity of the Party and the state make it imperative to raise the standard of Party leadership in advancing the economy and educating the people and to improve organising and political work among the masses. The Congress pointed out the importance of having all the units of the Party working smoothly, actively and purposefully. "This can be achieved", says the CC CPSU Report to the Congress, "only through unfailing application of the Leninist rules of Party life and principles of Party leadership, and the principle of democratic centralism."

This conclusion is well-founded and logical. At present, in the year of the 60th anniversary of the October Revolution, we have every reason to say that the Leninist principle of democratic centralism, which our Party has tested at diverse stages of struggle and in diverse conditions, has fully proved its worth and has invariably contributed to the success of the Communists' organising and political work. The experience of the CPSU furnishes a wealth of material for analysing the significance and application of this principle in the activity of our Marxist-Leninist Party.

I

The principle of democratic centralism was brought into being by the need to form a political party capable of organising the working class, rousing large

sections of the population to struggle and leading the masses to a revolutionary transformation of society. The idea of democratic centralism was contained in the Rules of the Communist League founded under the leadership of Marx and Engels. Lenin thoroughly substantiated and elaborated this principle, which was necessitated by his effort to bring about a new type of party and prompted by the experience of the struggle of Russia's workers and their vanguard.

The turn of the century in Russia was marked by an upsurge in the working-class movement, which culminated in the first Russian bourgeois democratic revolution (1905-07). In the course of class battles, especially in the first armed clashes with the tsarist regime, the working class of Russia began to realise that without a high degree of organisation and without solid unity of the will and action of its vanguard, it could not defeat a highly centralised bourgeois and landowner state commanding a gigantic coercive machinery.

Lenin and the Bolsheviks knew that if they were not to wait until capitalism began to "transform" itself and "grow" into socialism (as the opportunists expected it to) but were resolved to change society by revolutionary means; if the Party were not to bow to a spontaneous working-class movement, but were to organise the workers and lead them to a clearly defined ultimate goal; if it did not regard parliamentary debate as the main fighting method, but concentrated on mobilising the masses for struggle wherever possible, then the Party could not be an amorphous organisation like the Social-Democratic parties of the Second International. It must become a well-organised contingent operating on a principle that enabled it to combine democracy in drafting programmes and making decisions with centralised organisation in carrying out these programmes and decisions.

In the early years following the defeat of the first Russian revolution, some people in the Party wondered whether the Party should be preserved and should carry on its work. There were those (known as "liquidationists") who were ready to go back on the Party's principles by renouncing its programme, tactics and organisation. But the majority had learnt a different lesson. "Take the whole pre-revolutionary period and the first two and a half years of the revolution (1905-07)," Lenin wrote. "Compare our Social-Democratic Party during this whole period with the other parties in respect of unity, organisation, and continuity of policy. You will have to admit that *in this* respect our Party is *unquestionably* superior to *all* the others—the Cadets, the Socialist-Revolutionaries, etc." (*Coll. Works,* Vol. 13, p. 103). It was due to its unity and organisation, as Lenin repeatedly stressed, that the Party was able to lead millions in the struggle against tsarism, hold out in the years of reaction, lead the people to victory in the socialist revolution and consolidate the victory. We may now add that this enabled it to lead millions in the great cause of building socialism and in a trying but victorious war against fascism, and enables it today effectively to guide communist construction in our multinational state.

Democratic centralism as an organisational and political principle of activity of our Party was evolved and established in struggle against opportunism. However, it would be wrong to believe that it was the danger of opportunism gaining ground in the Russian Social-Democratic movement and in the Party that lead to the establishment of this principle. To think so would mean misinterpreting the issue and emphasing a factor which, though important, is subjective. Lenin's propositions in regard to Party building were prompted by his

[illegible] objective reality and by the tasks which the Party had to fulfil. [illegible] there any doubt that his principles of organising the Party, first of all the principle of democratic centralism, are the exact opposite of the notions which prompted the opportunists and which they tried to impose on the Bolsheviks. This opposition stemmed from the antithesis between the fundamental concept of social development and notions about the role of the working-class party in it.

Opportunism is logical in its own way. It holds that if the goal is not to transform society on revolutionary lines, then organisation, Party discipline and the principle of democratic centralism can apparently be dispensed with. In seeking and winning power, the Social-Democrats never intend to radically change anything in the capitalist system, in the substance of a system based on private property and the exploitation of labour. The idea never occurs to them, nor do they ever make such a change. In many cases, they turned out to be very convenient partners of the capitalists. This is why, in speaking of the watershed between revolutionary and opportunist trends, we stress that the concept of the goals of the movement has always conditioned everything else.

Revealingly, the opportunists have tried more than once to win over the Communists to their side—to induce them to renounce strict organisation and, above all, the principle of democratic centralism. This links up, among other things, with the problem of peaceful revolutionary development. But does the possibility of such development really make it necessary or advisable for the Communist party to abandon the principle of democratic centralism? The experience of our Party attests to something entirely different.

After the February bourgeois democratic revolution in Russia, it became possible to continue the revolution by peaceful means. But this did not at all imply the slightest revision of the Party's organisational principles. Indeed, Lenin saw the reasons for setbacks in the peaceful transfer of all power to the Soviets, specifically, in the workers' and peasants' inadequate class consciousness and organisation, and stressed the need to unite for proletarian class work so as to win over the majority. He repeatedly pointed out the importance of mobilising the Party and of its preparedness to change forms of struggle.

Developments showed that that was the only correct solution. Summing up the events of July 1917 later on, Lenin noted that the critical situation was inevitably leading the working class—perhaps with catastrophic speed—to a situation in which, due to a change in events beyond its control, it would find itself compelled to wage a determined battle with the counter-revolutionary bourgeoisie and thus gain power. This, of course, requires the greatest concentration and staunchness of the part of the proletariat and its Party.

But there is yet another aspect to the matter, one that became perfectly obvious afterwards.

After the victory of the socialist revolution our Party, having set out to build socialism, learnt from experience that to mobilise the masses for a great creative effort was a task likewise requiring organisation and leadership by a united working-class vanguard and that the new conditions made Party organisation as important as ever although its foundations and forms were being developed and enriched. Ever since then, the principle of democratic centralism has been a dependable basis for our Party's entire activity in building the new society. The 25th CPSU Congress stressed that Lenin's principles of Party building are not a

thing of the past but remain the basis for the Party [illegible] were.

II

The connection between the organisational problems of Party building and Party ideology is logical. Lenin described idea-less organisation as utterly absurd. The 25th Congress, for its part, pointed out this connection and had every reason to state that "on the basis of observance of the Leninist rules of Party life and the principles of Party leadership, the ideological and organisational unity of the Party ranks has been further consolidated". In fact, an ideologically heterogeneous party cannot organise properly because the important thing for the vanguard leading the working class and the people in the struggle for fundamental changes in society, for progress towards its higher formation, is not merely a temporary coincidence of views on this or that specific issue of programme or policy, but precisely ideological unity, as the experience of the CPSU has shown.

The question may arise: What makes it possible to apply the principle of democratic centralism, which is based on submission of the minority to the majority? Why is it that Communists who state their opinion on this or that question submit in the end to the decision adopted by the majority and proceed accordingly? because divergences of opinion bear on particulars and not on fundamental issues, and because the organisation is based on ideological unity.

Democratic centralism does not rule out but presupposes wide discussions on current problems of theory and practice, a free exchange of views, which, in turn, makes for closer ideological unity of the Party. Lenin pointed out that when opinions differ everyone must be enabled to present his view. The Party always abides by the following inviolable rules: discussion shall be based on the ideological principles of Marxism-Leninism; it must result in a decision, a sepcific individual or collective commitment, and responsibility; once adopted, a decision becomes law, and the Party expects every one of its members to carry it out without fail. "Discussing the problem," Lenin wrote, "expressing and hearing different opinions, ascertaining the views of the *majority* of the organised Marxists, expressing these views in the form of decisions . . . and carrying them out conscientiously—this is what reasonable people all over the world call *unity*" (Vol. 19, p. 519).

The Bolsheviks considered that if the Party failed to uphold its ideological unity and allowed compromise over ideology from the first, with the admission of new members, the organisation would in definite conditions be threatened with factionalism and even division. Our Party saw this above all during the discussions preceding its Tenth Congress (1921). There were important political discussions at the time. Elections in Party organisations were based on political platforms and that procedure was allowed even in electing delegates to the Tenth Congress. But experience showed that the need to subscribe to this or that platform prevented Communists from taking a stand of their own and from freely stating their opinions, and was an obstacle to a businesslike discussion of every issue. Group activity turned into attempts to create group discipline. The discussion they imposed on the Party did not lead to any constructive conclusions. The decisions of the Tenth Congress, which rebuffed the Trotskyists, the "workers' opposition", "democratic centralists" and other

opposition groups that sought to legalise the existence of diverse factions and groups in the Party, marked a real turn towards democratising Party life, raising the activity and extending the rights of every Party member. The relevant Congress resolution described the key task of the day as raising the level of the membership and drawing it into the life of the Party as a whole.

The principle of democratic centralism can be correctly understood and applied, we believe, only if the essence of conscious discipline is fully understood. It implies that anyone joining the Party is making his ideological choice and consciously bringing his behaviour and activity into line with principles, standards and rules worked out collectively. But while attaching the greatest importance to the very process of selecting and admitting people into the Party, we are far from simplistically imagining this to be sufficient. The Party strengthens its ideological unity, and hence the basis for its organisational unity, first, by drawing its members into discussions on current theoretical and ideological problems, as has been said (in the CPSU, many important theoretical and practical problems of developed socialism were discussed at Party congresses, CC plenums and representative theoretical conferences); secondly, by organising an in-depth study of Marxism-Leninism by the membership and applying the results in daily practice. The Party education system today encompasses about 20 million people. In the Azerbaijan SSR, almost 300,000 Communists and non-Party people attend various Party schools and classes. The Communists' ideological convictions, which are strengthened in this way, are the most reliable basis for conscious discipline, that is, the highest form of discipline. Lastly, Party discipline, being based on ideological convictions, is evolved in an atmosphere of broad and comprehensive democracy, active participation by every Communist in the shaping and implementation of Party policy and decisions of his own organisation. This is an important requirement of applying the principle of democratic centralism and is linked with the dialectics of the two aspects of this principle, a problem we will now proceed to discuss.

III

Democratic centralism is a principle, not a rigid formula. Its application and functioning are closely linked with the actual conditions in which the Party is operating. The standards of Party life stemming from democratic centralism and giving it concrete expression develop in step with the development of the Party itself as a political, ideological and organisational entity. Practice enriches this principle.

In our Party, the dialectical connection between the two aspects of this principle—democracy and centralism—has always been determined by the given situation. There have been periods in the history of our Party when conditions, far from favouring, prevented democratic discussion and solution of problems and at the same time demanded strict discipline from top to bottom. Those were the years of clandestinity, of the despotic regime of tsarist autocracy. The principle of democracy could certainly not be developed to the full in those conditions.[2] This did not mean, however, that if the circumstances changed the Party could not change the balance between centralism and democracy in favour of the latter. Our experience does not prove that illegality lays an all but everlasting imprint on Party activity. On the contrary, already during the first Russian revolution, Lenin's Party was the first to take advantage of the

temporary spell of freedom" to build a [illegible] structure, an electoral system, and representation at congresses according to the number of organised members" (Vol. 13, p: 103). Before October 1917, our Party held six congresses and seven conferences whose decisions were worked out by all delegates; there were elections to the Central Committee and CC meetings. There was a similar increase in the activity of Party members and collective forms of work developed fast after the victory of the February 1917 revolution. Party membership showed a rapid numerical growth, which in itself refuted the notion that the Party of Lenin with its organisational principles was adapted solely to narrow underground activity.

Unfailingly applying the Leninist standards of Party life and Party leadership, the principle of democratic centralism, and combating every breach of them, the Party has always displayed a highly principled approach. "The decisions of the 20th Party Congress were very important in this respect", says the CC CPSU Report to the 25th Party Congress. "...The decisions of the October 1964 plenary meeting of the Central Committee and the 23rd and 24th congresses of the Party played an important role in strengthening and carrying forward the Leninist standards and principles of Party life".

Today, under mature socialism, when comprehensive development of the people's creative activity and participation of millions in economic management, government and public affairs generally are becoming particularly imperative as objective requisites of social progress, it is just as objectively imperative to extend democratic principles in the life of the Party itself, raise the activity of its members in formulating and implementing Party policy, strategy and tactics, and ensure creative participation of the Party rank and file in all Party affairs. It is now more important than ever to take into account and compare different views on this or that question in the process of discussing it, weigh different circumstances, take counsel with non-Party people and bear their views in mind. The party is well aware of this objective requirement and reflects it in decisions of its leading committees and in day-to-day practice. Implementation of the decisions of the 24th and 25th Party congresses and of CC plenary meetings has been instrumental in promoting collective leadership at all levels and the democratic forms and methods of Party work.

The CPSU sees a real guarantee of successful solution of today's problems in encouraging the initiative of local Party organisations. In recent years, certain powers previously exercised by the CC CPSU have been delegated to the Central Committees of the Communist parties of the Union republics. Independent solution of local problems ensures implementation of the Party's general policy with due regard to the distinctive conditions in which the organisation concerned is operating. The powers of district Party committees have been extended, and important changes towards furthering democracy have taken place in the activity of Party branches. Specifically, in accordance with the decisions of the 25th CPSU Congress, the right to supervise the activity of administrative bodies has been granted (besides organisations functioning in the production sphere, which already had this right) to more than 170,000 branches with a membership exceeding four million. In our republic, virtually all the 8,591 Party branches have the right of supervision.

All fundamental issues of economic, political and social development, plans for the future and all projected changes bearing on the interests of the working

people are discussed at Party meetings and conferences and meetings of activists. This has become a firm rule in our republic's Party organisation today. Nor is it only a question of discussing prepared drafts but of Communists' participation in working them out. A widely practiced method is the setting up of working groups to analyse and formulate a concrete programme for the solution of this or that problem, standing committees, etc.

In preparing for a 1975 plenary meeting of its CC on the selection, placing and training of personnel, the Communist Party of Azerbaijan set up over 100 committees with CC members at their head. The committees carefully analysed work with personnel in most city and district Party organisations, all ministries, departments, and many research and cultural institutions. Their findings served as a basis for the documents of the plenum, whose decisions were subsequently discussed in all Party branches and won full approval among the Communists.

The logical result of this is a substantially higher level of creative activity on the part of the membership and greater participation by the rank and file in the affairs of the Party, on which implementation of its general line depends in decisive measure. For instance, over 94 per cent of the members took part in annual Party branch meetings during preparations for the 25th CPSU Congress and one in four spoke in the debate.

In Azerbaijan, so important a document as the CC CPSU Draft Guidelines for the Development of the National Economy of the USSR for 1976-80 was discussed at open Party meetings attended by 240,840 members and some 400,000 non-members. Almost 148,000 of them joined in the discussion and many of their proposals were taken into account in drawing up the five-year plans of factories, collective and state farms and republican ministries, and some particularly valuable ones were incorporated into the plans of certain economic branches of the entire Soviet Union.

The promotion of democratic principles is becoming the basis for educating people in the spirit of conscious discipline, responsibility, civic duty and thinking in terms of the whole state. An important feature of the Party is that the greater the scope of inner-Party democracy, the keener each Communist's sense of responsibility for the common cause. With democracy advancing, the idea of the common, of the whole, increasingly takes the form of conscious discipline.

All this shows convincingly enough the meaning of democratically conceived and democratically applied centralism, namely, the democratic centralism of a party functioning in the conditions of developed socialism. While the Party proceeds in the new conditions from a new ratio between centralism and local initiative, the two aspects of this twofold principle are not counterposed as it develops but are combined and strengthened. The CC CPSU Report to the 25th Congress emphasised that "we shall have to reinforce both principles of democratic centralism simultaneously".

IV

Democratic centralism, it will be recalled, is the scientific expression of the views of the working class on democracy and organisation, freedom and discipline. And since these views were embodied in the political organisation of the working class—the Marxist-Leninist party—their substance had to be embodied in one way or another in the state founded by the working class. It is only logical that, having established its own state, the working class was enabled

to organise all social development [illegible] in the interest of the masses.

Revealingly, the impact of the principle of democratic centralism on life in socialist society is singled out for criticism by bourgeois and Social-Democratic ideologists, who claim that the CPSU has "imposed" its accepted principle of democratic centralism upon society. Attempts are often made to counterpose the Communist Party to government agencies and mass organisations, treat the laws of social development and the aims set by the Party as antitheses, make it appear that the Party, being the only ruling party in our conditions, substitutes itself for everyone and everything.

In this connection, I would like to draw attention to the following circumstances.

First, in the Soviet state, elements of democratic centralism, namely, electivity of the leading bodies, their accountability to the electorate and their removability, naturally became a practice of local government bodies almost as soon as these came into being. The principles of centralism, the subordination of lower to higher bodies are prompted mainly by the need to manage a national economy based on public ownership of the means of production. This objectively demands one centralised leadership. To be sure, it poses the problem of properly combining local initiative and independent action with centralised unity in administration. "Stereotyped forms and uniformity imposed from above," Lenin emphasised, "have nothing in common with democratic and socialist centralism. The unity of essentials, of fundamentals, of the substance, is not disturbed but ensured by *variety* in details, in specific local features, in methods of *approach*, in *methods* of exercising control..." (Vol. 26, p. 413). The Party has carefully considered this problem at diverse stages and has solved it according to the given situation.

Second, in carrying on its work, the Party gives general political guidance to government agencies and mass organisations without substituting itself for them or exercising petty tutelage. For their part, these agencies and organisations, which are vested with extensive powers, organise their work in line with Party policy. The development aims of Soviet society, formulated by the Communist Party, are an expression of objective laws of socialist construction and meet the people's fundamental interests or they could never have been achieved.

Ours has become a state of the whole people, whose interests and will it expresses. A new historical community has taken shape in our country—the Soviet people—which rests on the unbreakable alliance of the workers, peasants and intellectuals, with the working class playing the leading role. Being the vanguard of the working class and the whole people, the Party occupies a central place in the political organisation of Soviet society. In our conditions, this is a result of historical development.[3] Needless to say, a different set of circumstances may give rise to a different political structure implying the existence of several parties, as is now the case in some socialist countries.

The chief criterion of acceptability of a political structure is, in our view, to guarantee genuine democracy for the working people and genuine participation of the masses in the management of society. Our search follows the lines of further development of socialist democracy based on the working people's constant and many-sided participation in government, production and all other spheres of public life through collective discussion of key draft decisions, all of

[illegible] centralism successfully serves. This is seen in the growing activity of government bodies at all levels, the trade unions, people's control bodies, general meetings, production and other conferences, and various organisations of the working people.

Speaking at the Conference of the Communist and Workers' Parties of Europe, L. I. Brezhnev cited these characteristic figures: more than two million persons are elected to Soviets of Working People's Deputies and nearly 30 million work as activists of the Soviets, helping voluntarily and without any compensation in the vast and complex business of governing the state. Another nine million work in elected people's control bodies, through which they bring to light bureaucratic practices and instances of carelessness. Permanent production conferences, 65 per cent of whose members are workers, have been constituted at enterprises. In 1975 alone, more than one million proposals advanced by these conferences designed to raise output and improve working conditions were put into effect.

In Azerbaijan, 48,159 persons have been elected deputies to local Soviets and 55.2 per cent of them are non-Communists, By taking part in the management, deputies carry out the mandate of their electors. Out of the 17,512 mandates received by deputies to local Soviets during the latest elections and approved by working people's meetings, more than 13,780 were carried out in 1976. These are measures intended to modernise communities and improve working and living conditions.

Long-term economic development plans are discussed by all working people before they are submitted to the Supreme Soviet of the USSR for approval. Draft economic plans are discussed on a similar scale in the republics, regions, territories cities and districts. Plans adopted by a majority become a law binding on all.

These are highly indicative facts. They go to show that when our Party sets the task of making fuller use of the advantages of the socialist system, it has in mind primarily one of the main advantages—the inexhaustible reserves of people's labour and social energy, the initiative and conscious participation of all in *economic and political activity.*

Today the working people of our republic, like the whole Soviet people, are enthusiastically carrying out the plans charted by the 25th CPSU Congress. This noble constructive activity is being guided by the great Party of Lenin—the Communist vanguard equipped with an advanced theory, well-organised and closely-knit. We will continue to base our activity on the Leninist principle of democratic centralism because today's reality bears out the conclusion: this principle, applied dialectically and creatively, corresponds to the very essence of a Marxist-Leninist party and the fundamental aims of its activity and is inseparable from it.

---

[1] All quotations from the Congress records here and elsewhere refer to the CC Report presented by L. I. Brezhnev.—*Ed.*

[2] It is noteworthy that even then, in conditions of illegality, the Bolshevik Party conducted opinion polls among its members on the most important problems of Party life. In 1913 for instance, Party members were asked to discuss the stand to be taken by local Party organisations on the formation of independent Bolshevik group in the Fourth State Duma and on the splitting activities of the Mensheviks. Summing up the results of the discussion, Lenin wrote: "No other political party in Russia can show, for the whole period of the counter-revolution in general and for 1913 in particular, a similar *open and mass opinion poll of all its members* on a most important issue of Party life. None of the legalised parties in Russia, none of the wealthy liberal and democratic parties, which have a

continued overleaf

aspects of the situation in Laos, and concentrating on the primary, [illegible] task, that of uniting the whole people and mobilising their forces in the struggle for national liberation.

The imperialists who attacked our country always sought an alliance with reactionary feudal elements to use them as their mainstay and tool in suppressing the people. Feudal reaction, for its part, had invariably and faithfully served the imperialists to retain its own privileges. When US imperialism began its war of aggression in Laos, it did its best to win the support of feudal lords, feudal bureaucrats and reactionary segments of the bourgeoisie and make them the social basis for its neocolonialist policy.

A long period of oppression had left all the ethnic groups, classes and social strata of the exploited people of Laos with a common hatred for imperialism. Some bourgeois and feudal elements and even some members of the royal family joined of their own free will in the front of resistance to the aggressors. Therefore the main contradiction was that between the Laotian people and imperialism, and resolving it was a priority in the revolutionary struggle. The principal enemies of the revolution at the time were the imperialists and their zealous lackeys, members of the comprador bourgeoisie, bureaucrats, militarists and feudal reactionaries. Had this obstacle not been removed, Laotian society would have been unable to make headway. Hence the immediate task was to raise the national banner, unite and mobilise the forces of the whole nation, direct their effort against the chief enemy and fight for national liberation. To accomplish this task and win genuine national independence, freedom and democracy, it was indispensable to defeat the imperialists, feudal lords and compradors.

Along with the national aspect of the revolution, account had to be taken of its democratic aspect. Ninety per cent of the population are peasants, an important force in both the production sphere and revolutionary struggle. They bore the brunt of exploitation by the imperialist aggressors and their reactionary henchmen, who succeeded one another in oppressing our country. In Laotian conditions, to free the nation and restore the people's democratic freedoms meant, first and foremost, freeing all peasants irrespective of ethnic origin and granting them democratic rights. This is why the task of raising the banner of democracy and freeding the peasants from feudal and pre-feudal exploitation, as well as of education, winning over and mobilising the rural masses was a matter of paramount, strategic importance to the revolution.

The two objectives—the national and the democratic—are inseparable; they influence, complement and stimulate each other. The national task comes first, for it is under its banner that freedom fighters unite. Fulfilment of the democratic task provides the main source of strength for the revolution, enabling it to achieve the national goal. In this process, the democratic aspect is subordinate to the national aspect and depends on it.

However, the effort to attain these objectives must be wisely adapted to the exigencies of the situation. Realisation of the democratic task must be continuous so as to bring about the simultaneous and complete achievement of both strategic goals. These consist in defeating imperialism to re-establish national independence and in overthrowing the feudal class and comprador bourgeoisie to guarantee the people democratic freedoms and create prerequisites for the advance of the revolution to a new stage.

To solve the problem of these inherent and dialectical inter-relations with due

regard to national realities, our Party championed the concentration of all revolutionary and progressive forces to fight against the imperialist aggressor, for national salvation. It expected the democratic task to be accomplished simultaneously but gradually, bearing in mind the primacy of the national objective.

The Party called for solidarity, equality, mutual assistance and better living conditions, thus expressing the people's democratic demands in the political and economic spheres, first of all the demands of peasants belonging to diverse ethnic groups. The Party drew the masses into the implementation of democratic reforms aimed at curbing and then destroying feudal and pre-feudal exploitation in any form. At the same time, it worked to mobilise the peasants and help them in the struggle against poverty and backwardness, for progress in culture, education and health care. It helped them to organise mutual assistance in various forms to intensify production and gradually improve their living and cultural standards. The Party worked continuously to materialise democracy and equality among the diverse ethnic groups, foster their solidarity, support the people's forces in every way and build them up so as to further the revolution.

By correctly solving the problem of the relationship between the national and democratic tasks and defining their content, the Laotian revolution increased its strength, gradually extended the national unity front, divided the classes hostile to it and localised them. It carried on a meaningful struggle to isolate and weaken the chief enemy, defeated the principal contingents of reaction one by one, achieved victory after victory and fully triumphed in the end, accomplishing the national and democratic tasks throughout the country.

2. *Effectively mobilising the peasants, forming a solid worker-peasant alliance, and transforming it into the main force of the revolution and into the pivot of a united national front led by the Party of the working class.*

The worker-peasant alliance is a fundamental principle of Marxism-Leninism and its formation is a general law for every revolution led by the working class, a requisite of successful national democratic and the socialist revolutions.

Laos is a backward, agrarian country with strong survivals of feudalism and a predominantly small-scale, fragmented agriculture. Its population is composed of numerous ethnic groups. The economic development level varies from area to area and from ethnic group to ethnic group. The working class is still in the making. Naturally, forming a worker-peasant alliance in such a country is particularly important.

The colonialists and feudal lords brutally oppressed and exploited the peasants, who were doomed to perpetual poverty. The peasants strove for independence, freedom and a decent life. The period of French colonisation was punctuated with risings among peasants of every nationality. But those spontaneous actions, on which the class nature of the participants imposed considerable limitations failed one after another. They lacked a correct and consistent policy, which only a vanguard party can evolve. Our Party, giving due credit to the peasants' big role and revolutionary spirit, propagated Marxism-Leninism among them, applying it to the policy of the national democratic revolution, and showed them the way to national and social liberation.

Operating in complicated conditions, the Party found a solution to the peasant problem by encouraging relations of fraternal solidarity among the entire population, primarily among peasants of different nationalities and tribes. This

enabled it to mobilise this huge force and draw it into the revolutionary struggle.

The Party carried out all this work, aimed at winning greater influence, educating the people and organising joint actions through its members, the men and officers of its armed forces, and its mass propaganda and mobilisation groups. Simultaneously the Party effected, step by step, progressive changes that provided the peasants with economic and political rights and benefits. It gradually removed every form of exploitation and helped the peasants to combat poverty and backwardness and improve their living conditions. Therefore the peasants invariably showed sincere devotion to the Party; the worker-peasant alliance was consolidated, and passed various trials with flying colours.

The conditions of our epoch, which are highly favourable to all revolutionary streams because socialism has become a world system, are a most important factor whose wise use with due regard to the realities of our country fully confirmed the following great truth: even in backward, agrarian countries, where the working class is only just beginning to emerge, it is possible and necessary to establish a solid worker-peasant alliance led by a Marxist-Leninist party so as steadfastly to further the revolution in the spirit of history, that is, in the direction of national independence, which is closely bound up with socialism. Without this, the revolution cannot win.

3. *Forming a broad united national front on the basis of a solid worker-peasant alliance led by the Party, setting correct and specific political tasks, using a variety of organisational forms in accordance with the given stage of the revolutionary struggle, continuously extending this front, splitting the forces of the chief enemy and isolating them to the utmost.*

The century-long experience of our people's fight against foreign aggression shows that a small people, who are, moreover, ethnically heterogeneous and have to resist a conqueror vastly superior in strength, must form a bloc as solid as steel to strike at the enemy, defeat him and uphold their national independence and sovereignty.

I have said that our Party solved this problem by forming a solid worker-peasant alliance as the basis for a united national front. The Party found correct and specific political solutions and used organisational forms corresponding to the given stage of the revolution and aimed at uniting all the forces of the nation, all sects, prominent national leaders and adherents of diverse progressive trends to divide the enemy, isolate him and spearhead the struggle against the imperialist aggressors and their reactionary lackeys.

One of the most noteworthy successes of the Party's united front policy was that the intermediate social forces were brought in, which is an important strategic principle of every proletarian party, especially at the national democratic stage of the revolution. In Laos, where social differentiation has not yet gone far enough, the neutralist intermediate strata played an important part in the economy and politics and had their own political party and armed forces, They were dissatisfied with the imperialist policy of war and aggression, wanted to see their country independent and were searching for a way to achieve this goal. The Party regarded them as a force of the national democratic revolution and used the Patriotic Front of Laos (the national unity front organised by the Party) as a special form of alliance with neutralist strata.

This alliance was set up in the course of mobilisation, persuasion and education. It required unrelenting effort and found expression, first of all, in

everyday activities and in the formulation of concrete tasks. Afterwards it developed into a political alignment on the baiss of a broad common programme proposed by the Party. The next stage of its development was military and political unity in the struggle for common objectives specified for every sector. The Party strove gradually and meaningfully to win the neutralist forces for service in the people's cause. By combining loyalty to principle with flexibility in carrying out the various political tasks of the Front, we forged national unity and directed the energy of the whole nation towards achieving the aims of the revolution.

A decisive factor for the fruitful activity of the Front in addition to the Party's correct policy was the unification of working people of all ethnic groups. Its basis was the worker-peasant alliance. Without the backing of these genuinely revolutionary forces, it would have been impossible, even using a flexible policy and efficient methods, to win over the intermediate strata and the progressive section of the upper strata to the side of the revolution. The forces capable of rallying together in a broad united national front under the Party's leadership could do so only be leaning on the working people and the worker-peasant alliance as a basis, accurately analysing the alignment of classes and social strata, ascertaining the potentialities of the revolution at its every stage and working out an appropriate and specific policy.

4. *Showing unfailing loyalty to strategic goals, abiding strictly by the theory of revolutionary violence and offensive strategy, stepping up the dynamics of the revolution, applying the right revolutionary methods, and exploiting partial gains to achieve complete victory.*

The Laotian revolution could not, of course, expect an easy victory over major imperialist powers commanding a large military economic potential. It had to advance gradually, using the opportunities afforded by our epoch and passing through many phases to force the enemy back step by step and defeat him in the end.

Fighting methods are conditioned by the phase and dynamics of the revolution, as well as by the quality of the leadership provided by the vanguard party. They are entirely effective only in so far as the theory of revolutionary violence is applied correctly and the spirit of an offensive strategy maintained, and provided the revolutionary forces win new positions and operate jointly against vital enemy positions (political, military, economic and control centres of the counter-revolution, etc.).

Revolutionary violence takes two basic forms: political and military. Imperialism held our people in subjection by carrying on a twofold policy: brutal repression and treacherous political and economic bribery. Its system of coercion involved every family and every citizen. This necessitated an effective combination of the two basic methods and forms of violence.

The struggle for a coalition, or, in other words, for a compromise is a characteristic of our revolution. The revolution must be willing to compromise in certain situations so as to consolidate and develop its forces and to contain, split and isolate the enemy. In turn, an enemy who is compelled to accept such a compromise tries continuously to counter-attack the revolutionary forces so as to weaken and then destroy them either through "peaceful development" or through counter-revolutionary violence.

Compromise can only be achieved in the presence of such factors as steady

consolidation of the revolutionary forces, powerful support from the mass movement, and courageous and competent Party cadres. Had we relied solely on our representatives in coalition bodies and had they even been in a majority and held high positions enabling them to impose progressive legislation and decrees, this would not really have benefited the people, for the other echelons of the repressive and administrative machinery, being still in the enemy's hands, would have enabled him to carry on subversion or resist every measure beneficial to the people.

We also fought in parliament and in the legal sphere. We know by experience that this can produce good results in certain conditions, but it is not the important thing. What is important is to use legal opportunities for mobilising the people, organising their forces, extending the front, dividing and isolating the enemy, and bringing the masses into the political struggle. The revolution must be able to accept a compromise or to renounce it as soon as the enemy makes a volteface or when the compromise becomes a hindrance to the revolution, especially when the struggle has reached the highest degree of intensity, conditions are ripe for an explosion and an immediate revolutionary situation has arisen.

5. *Working continuously to create a favourable revolutionary situation, using this situation, turning it into a real force, stepping up the dynamics of the revolution, preparing in advance for revolutionary leaps and taking direct measures to bring them about.*

A revolutionary situation is created by definite objective and subjective conditions. The party leading the struggle must contribute to the development of the prerequisites for an immediate revolutionary situation. As soon as this situation arises, the party, fulfilling its sacred mission in regard to history and to its country, must take a decision to bring about a revolutionary leap. To miss this opportunity is to make a most grave mistake and injure the interests of the people and country. When, in 1945, the Soviet Red Army defeated fascism and the August Revolution triumphed in Vietnam, our Party took advantage of the situation to call for a rising whose victorious outcome was finalised by the declaration of independence on October 12 of that year.

Thirty years later our Party, taking into account the victorious outcome of two resistance wars against the French and US imperialists, as well as the partial gains of two years of struggle for a coalition under the Vientiane agreements (February 21, 1973), resolved to muster forces according to a carefully devised and co-ordinated plan. Steps were taken to hasten the formation of political and armed forces, fortify the liberated zone, that rear base of the revolution, take up strategic positions in the enemy-controlled zone, extend the political and legal front, bring the masses into the struggle for the partial assumption of power, and prepare actively for a general offensive and a general rising, which originally was set for the dry season of 1975/76.

By early May 1975, the final victory of the great offensive and the risings launched by the armed forces and people all over South Vietnam, as well as victory in the liberation war of the armed forces and people of Kampuchea, had had a powerful impact on the revolutionary situation in Laos, which had fully matured by them. The mass movement had assumed an unprecedented scale and become irreversible. The US imperialists and their flunkeys found themselves in disarray. Taking advantage of the victorious leap of the revolution in other

countries of Indochina and stepping up its dynamics in Laos to the utmost, our Party adopted the strategic decision immediately to launch a general offensive and simultaneous risings so as to seize all power at the earliest possible date.

In so doing, we relied on our decisive positions in the three zones, flexibly combined the basic forms of struggle—armed, political and diplomatic—and supplemented them with legal struggle.

Not to miss a situation, use it to the hilt and act in time means increasing the forces of the revolution tenfold and winning new positions to crush and paralyse the enemy. The revolution transferred all power to the people, staving off an internecine war. That was how the rare and valuable opportunity of taking power by peaceful means—an opportunity provided to us and foreseen by Lenin—became a reality.

Revolutionary situation and revolutionary forces are inherently interconnected matters. Only by mustering forces and organising them properly can the requisite situation be created; and only by firmly using the situation after promptly and correctly working out a strategic solution is it possible to win new positions and bring into being new forces capable of rapidly advancing the revolution by leaps.

6. *Remaining loyal to genuine proletarian internationalism, steadfastly consolidating the alliance and militant solidarity of the three countries of Indochina, using the opportunities afforded by our epoch, and relying on the moral support and concrete assistance of the world socialist system, the national liberation movement, the movement for democracy and social progress and all the peace-loving peoples of the world.*

The splendid victory of the Laotian revolution confirmed the truth that in our epoch even a small, sparsely populated and economically underdeveloped country cannot be subdued by any imperialist aggressor if it is led by a Marxist-Leninist party following a correct policy and using proper methods, if it is resolved to fight for independence and freedom and if its just cause is backed by the socialist countries, the international Communist and working-class movement, the national liberation movement and all the peoples of the planet striving for peace and justice.

The solid and long-standing alliance between the Laotian people and the two fraternal peoples of Indochina was an important factor for the victory of the revolution in each of our countries and is a dependable earnest of our future victories.

In the epoch of transition from capitalism to socialism on a world scale, the Laotian revolution has ensured itself the sympathy, unanimous approval and effective assistance of socialist and friendly countries on all continents through its fight against imperialism and old and new colonialism, for peace, national independence, democracy and socialism, and through a foreign policy promoting solidarity and mutual support among progressive forces.

Today every people beginning to fight for national liberation must lean on the socialist system, bulwark of the world revolutionary process. This is the only way in which they can defeat aggressive imperialism and achieve complete victory.

7. *Forming a genuine Marxist-Leninist party, making it the leading centre of the revolution, steadily enhancing the class nature of the Party and maintaining its ability to perform its leading role.*

This is the decisive factor for the victory of the revolution in our country. A

worthy continuer of the cause of the Communist Party of Indochina founded by the great Ho Chi Minh, the PRPL was born in the battle between revolutionary and counter-revolutionary forces in our region. For the revolutionaries and peoples of Laos, Marxism-Leninism has become a torch illuminating their path to national liberation, for an end to exploitation, poverty and backwardness, for a renewed country, for the prosperity and happiness of the whole people.

The rise of the PRPL was the result of a historical link-up of the patriotic novement of the whole people with Marxism-Leninism, whose spread in ndochina, begun by Ho Chi Minh, soon aroused class consciousness in all the ppressed countries of Indochina. Serious difficulties had to be overcome in the rocess, of course. They were due to the fact that the Marxist-Leninist party had o be created in a colonial, feudal country with lingering survivals of pre-feudal ocial formations, with underdeveloped economy and culture, an indistinct class lifferentiation and a proletariat that was only just emerging (there is still no arge-scale industry).

Applying the Leninist principles of building a proletarian party of the new type n Laos, we always regarded the problem of accentuating its class character as ne of key importance. This is the main thing in forming a vanguard party.

In the trying conditions of a protracted resistance fight, the PRPL, vercoming innumerable difficulties, set up Party schools and classes for the tudy of Marxism-Leninism and the line and concrete tasks of the Party, for both adre and rank-and-file members. They learned to ascertain the requirements of he national-liberation and class struggle. By constantly combining theoretical tudies with everyday activities, the Party was able to impart a Marxist outlook nd a class position to them and to teach them the art of leadership. All this trengthened the Party.

On the organisational plane, the Party did much to educate, select and bring nto its ranks the finest workers, peasants, soldiers, intellectuals and other vorking people of every nationality who had passed the test of revolutionary attles. It made a special effort to organise and educate the workers and make hem aware of their mission so as to put the Party on a solid class foundation.

Selecting the finest fighters, drawing them into the Party, actively studying Marxism-Leninism and the Party's line and concrete political tasks, educating nd training its members in accordance with the realities of revolutionary truggle, and fostering the class awareness and efficiency of Party members and rganisations were the main lines we followed in building the Party.

Success in this effort is the principal condition if the PRPL is to assure the omplete victory of the national democratic revolution. This explains why our 'arty, which came into being in an underdeveloped, backward society, is ssentially a Marxist-Leminist party none the less, the organised vanguard and nost advanced force of the working class. The PRPL has retained and increased s role as the sole leader of the revolution, for the people, prompted by their own xperience, trust the Party leadership without qualification, rally closely behind he line and political tasks of the PRPL, and are entirely devoted to the Party and villing to follow it. This is the decisive factor for our recent victory in a great ational battle. It will also ensure victory in the incipient socialist revolution.

* * * *

The national democratic revolution in Laos is at its closing stage. Our country

is taking the road of socialist construction, bypassing the stage of capitalist development.

A progressive political system has been established in Laos. However, the country's backward mode of production is out of keeping with this system. The material prerequisites of building socialism are very modest at the moment. Besides, class enemies and foreign reactionaries are engaged in sustained subversion against our revolution. In this situation, the Party is striving to carry out the following tasks: consolidate the dictatorship of the proletariat, eliminate the effects of neocolonialism, heal the wounds inflicted by the war, gradually reorganise small-scale production, primarily the fragmented agriculture, pave the way for large-scale socialist production and raise the people's standard of life step by step.

These are historic tasks for a country which after a century of colonial domination and thirty years of devastating war has been transformed by a victorious revolution into an outpost of the socialist system in Southeast Asia and which daily resists imperialist and reactionary attempts to eliminate the influence of socialism in this region of the globe.

Realising its duty to the nation and the world revolutionary movement, our Party is determined to carry high the banner of independence, democracy and socialism, mobilise the people and unite them even more closely, be vigilant and build up the revolutionary power and the armed forces, thereby fulfilling simultaneously two highly important tasks of the day.

One of these tasks is to revive production, normalise the economy and rapidly provide the material and technical basis for the country's advance to the stage of building socialism. The other task is to ensure the country's defence and safeguard revolutionary power against the subversive and aggressive actions of imperialism and its underlings.

We are certain that our people will build a peaceful, independent, socialist and prosperous Laos by drawing on the natural resources of their country, using primarily their own forces and relying on their own constructive effort and also on the assistance and co-operation of fraternal and friendly countries.

---

[1] Along with armed, political and diplomatic struggle, the leaders of the Laotian revolution speak of legal struggle, meaning the activity of revolutionary patriotic forces in the diverse government agencies set up in the country on a coalition basis.—*Ed.*

Stepping up the Effort for Peace and Detente—Purpose and Determination

ALBERTO KOHEN
(Argentina)
Chairman, *WMR* Commission on Problems of Peace and Democratic Movements

THESE lines were written in Moscow, under the impression of the World Forum of Peace Forces. Romesh Chandra, General Secretary of the World Peace Council, whom your correspondent interviewed, described the Forum as an event that is bound to contribute to the unity of peace champions and to the effectiveness and continuity of their work. The global conception of detente, of its scope and significance, which the Forum proposed, he said, will become a guiding star for millions of peace fighters.

From January 14 to 16, the impressive panorama of the battle for world peace and detente unfolded before 500 delegates from 115 countries representing over 70 international and 220 national and regional organisations. After the plenary sittings, many delegates walked to the Rossia Hotel from the CMEA building, where the Forum was held, along Kalinin Avenue, past the Manege and across Red Square where, behind the Kremlin wall, the apartment and office of Lenin, the founder of the Soviet State, are preserved intact. There was something highly symbolic in that.

I could not help recalling the historical path leading from Lenin's Decree on Peace proclaimed in the early hours of Soviet power, from his ideas of peaceful coexistence, to the Peace Programme adopted in the Kremlin by the 24th Congress of the CPSU, the Programme of Further Struggle for Peace and International Co-operation, for the Freedom and Independence of Peoples, approved by the 25th CPSU Congress, and the peace initiatives and consistent peace policy of the CPSU and the Soviet government.

Many speakers at the Forum had high praise for the outstanding role of the Soviet Union and other countries of the socialist community in the struggle for peace and for the transition from cold war to detente. They stressed that the victorious fight for the national independence and freedom of the peoples of Indochina, Mozambique and Angola, the overthrow of the facist regimes of Portugal and Greece, and the signing of the Helsinki Final Act have provided new opportunities for mankind to advance more rapidly along the road of peace and social progress.

The Moscow Forum, too, was an expression of these changes. It showed again that the dialectical interconnection of peace, social progress and the future of mankind is becoming ever more pronounced, influencing the thoughts and actions of the general public. Many of these actions are a result of well-considered and co-ordinated plans. Others come spontaneously, being prompted by a striving for peace that is sincere, if not entirely conscious, by hard living conditions, by concern for the future of one's children and grandchildren. And just as a small spring gives rise to a big river, so the living springs of people's

initiatives today give new strength and depth to the powerful peace movement. It has never been as vast and meaningful as now.

Recent years have seen the spectrum of peace forces extend with every new international meeting. Their goal is to eliminate the threat of a world war and base relations between states on the principles of just and lasting peace and international co-operation. Along with organisations and movements traditionally coming out for peace, it now includes the World Association of World Federalists, World Council of Churches, International Peace Bureau, and other international peace organisations. More and more government spokesmen of countries with different social systems are joining the peace movement.

The Moscow Forum was indicative in this respect. In addition to various peace movements, influential political parties and religious trends, the delegates represented governments and parliaments. The Forum did not adopt resolutions or recommendations. Its purpose was to bring together representatives of world opinion for a discussion of important aspects of detente, ways of promoting it, and the relationship between detente and urgent international problems. Much attention was given to co-operation among the peace forces.

"We've come to Moscow," Knud Nielsen, Chairman of the World Association of World Federalists, told newsmen on the eve of the Forum, "to solve what can be solved today without widening differences, and to reach agreement on solving tomorrow what we cannot solve today. Because, for all the difference of views, we must all act and win together or we'll lose together."

A quest for mutually acceptable solutions was the keynote of the Forum. The dialogue between members of various trends in the peace movement, between people of different political views and ideological convictions, revealed agreement on many pressing issues.

It was stressed at the Forum that world public opinion is gaining influence as a factor in resolving the international problems involved in the struggle for peace, democracy and national independence, for extension of detente. World opinion played an immense role in the campaign to end the US war of aggression in Indochina, in the preparation and convening of the Helsinki Conference and in a number of other undertakings, including the over 400 million signatures to the new Stockholm Appeal. It helps to take peace initiatives at government level and strengthen the Union Nations. World opinion contributes to the implementation of UN decisions and resolutions aimed at ensuring international security and national independence and helps to expand and consolidate detente.

Plenary sittings of the Forum and its 13 discussion groups concerned themselves with ways of consolidating and multiplying the gains made by the world public over the past years in order to make detente an irreversible and universal process. This was not a quest for some new magic formulas. For peace builders, as participants in peace movements are frequently referred to, realise that the opportunities afforded by the new world situation have yet to be fully used. There is still room for the movement to grow in scope and strength. Although the activity of the peace forces is unquestionably facilitated and even stimulated by agreements reached at government level, detente is clearly far from complete. It has not yet become universal, and new challenging tasks are still awaiting solution. These tasks were discussed constructively at the Forum.

The dialogue will be continued. Discussion group members proposed new meetings, seminars, symposiums, conferences and other joint measures. The

Forum's closing communique calls on political parties, organisations and movements and all peace forces to join in these initiatives. The new permanent collective body set up by the Forum—International Forum for Liaison Among Peace Forces—will play a notable part in putting these proposals into practice.

The speeches I heard at the Forum and the interviews I had with delegates gave me a vivid idea of the hopes and aspirations which people of different ways of thinking associate with the struggle for detente, disarmament and peace. Here are a few brief comments by Forum delegates:

Reginard September, member of the African National Congress leadership, South Africa: "The struggle for national freedom and against racism and the struggle for peace are interrelated. My people link their longing for freedom with peace."

Sean McBride, President, International Peace Bureau: "Disarmament is important for both the survival of mankind and the development of backward regions. Nations spend $330,000 million on armaments annually. The world would be different if this money were spent on meeting people's needs."

Saunora Graham, Vice-Mayor of Cambridge, USA: "My people and I believe that there are better ways of spending money than wasting billions of dollars on bombers, bombs and missiles."

It was not at all accidental that the incompatibility of detente with the arms race was pointed out in many speeches. The arms race, delegates emphasised, slows down detente and indeed, threatens to undermine or even stop it. Resolute action is needed against the concepts of the inevitability of the arms race and the impossibility of disarmament, against the notorious idea of "prosperity through armament", against stepping up war hysteria through misinformation and falsehoods about a "Soviet threat". Before it is too late, we must put an end to the arms race, which creates an explosive situation, press for the elimination of existing seats of conflict and tension on a peaceful, democratic and fair basis, prevent new conflicts, rule out the use of force in international relations, make impossible the use or proliferation of nuclear and other weapons of mass annihilation and ban the development of new, still more dangerous weapons.

Delegates pointed out that extreme reaction raises obstacles to continued detente. Therefore life itself calls for greater effort to make detente universal and irreversible. The goals of detente and the anti-war aims of the peace forces link up increasingly with the struggle for the solution of social and economic problems. for freedom and democracy, against fascism, racism, colonialism and neocolonialism, for judicious utilisation of natural resources, the protection of man's health and the environment, equitable international economic relations and the right of every people to shape its destiny in freedom and independence. Luis Corvalan was among those who spoke of this at the Forum— he stressed the close connection existing between the peace effort and the struggle against fascism and for democratic freedoms. This is also manifest in actions by civilian and military peace-loving, democratic and patriotic forces in my own country, Argentina, including actions by representatives of official Argentina, as General Vidda, President of the Republic, pointed out, Their fight against attempts by aggressive circles of US imperialism to bring into being a South Atlantic Pact is closely related to the effort to prevent a dangerous, obsessed minority from trying to establish a regime patterned on Pinochet's. At the same time it is part of

the struggle of all peoples for detente. It facilitates this struggle, and derives from it the strength and solidarity so needed for victory.

Detente is the main road of peace and progress, says the communique of the World Forum of Peace Forces.

"The important thing today," said Leonid Brezhnev, General Secretary of the CC CPSU, in a message of greetings to the delegates, "is to act, to find reasonable solutions which would lead as early as possible, and without procrastination, to real disarmament, to the materialisation of detente and its transformation into a genuinely universal and genuinely irreversible process."

Communists have always attached great importance to the role of public opinion in solving international problems. The emergence of the masses on the political scene is a most typical indication of the process of deep social changes that began in the world six decades ago with the victory of the Great October Socialist Revolution. Lenin foresaw that the revolutionary struggle would open the way for new hundreds of millions of people whom no imperialist power, however strong, could keep out of world development. His forecast has come true.

Marxist-Leninist parties—both were they have already been put in power by the people and where they are still fighting in harsh and difficult conditions—contribute to the development and consolidation of the peace movement. Experience has shown that this helps to step up the struggle of the working class and other working people, of the trade unions, women's and youth organisations, of all social forces, against the threat of war, for the solution of pressing social and economic problems. At the World Forum of Peace Forces, Communists from various countries took an active part in the dialogue and in the formulation of common positions with socialist, social-democratic, christian democratic, liberal, radical and centre parties and with spokesmen of the national liberation movement. All were guided by their principles, but there was unity, without any concessions to anti-communism, anti-Sovietism, racism or fascism.

This position of the Communists is inspired by proletarian internationalism and the genuine socialist humanism inherent in the teachings of Marx, Engels and Lenin. It meets mankind's vital interests and helps to foster unity of action among broad social forces for peace, security and a better future for all peoples. It is highly indicative that this fresh powerful call on the peace forces to unite and coordinate their efforts rang out from the World Forum of Peace Forces in Moscow, capital of the first state of working people, that has made the building of socialism and communism its programme.

U.S. "Hawks" Step up Activities

WILLIAM JACKSON
American Journalist

THERE is no doubt that the most outspoken US militarists and their underlings, known as "hawks", are stopping up their activities. Their utterances cause concern to millions of realistic-minded people in the United States and the world.

What makes the "hawks"sharpen their talons and scream so ominously? It is fear. Fear of the fact that the socialist world is going from strength to strength. The ideas of detente, disarmament and co-operation between countries with different social systems are gaining ground among the masses. Beneficial changes in the international climate and a new balance of forces in favour of peace and socialism have led to impressive gains in the struggle for national liberation and social progress and given the Communist and Workers' parties added prestige. Lastly, there are more and more sober-minded people even among the ruling classes of the capitalist world while extreme reactionaries, or "hawks", find themselves in increasing isolation as a minority in the ruling minority. Peaceful development threatens to lose them political and economic leverage and positions. Terrified by the inexorable march of history, they are trying to turn it back.

Revealingly, the "hawks" stepped-up activity was preceded by an almost two-year campaign during which reactionaries in the USA and other NATO countries strove to galvanise the cold war policy be telling parliaments and public opinion that the West was "lagging dangerously" behind the Soviet Union and other countries of the socialist community in defence measures. The arguments used by them included the claim that detente had brought the socialist countries "unilateral" advantages and that the capitalist countries' military spending was not enough.

More recently, the assertion that the West is "lagging" has been supplemented with allegations about an "increased Soviet military threat". NATO Supreme Commander, General Alexander Haig, told *US News & World Report* that "Soviet military capabilities have been growing at a relentless pace"[1] and insisted that all NATO countries must increase military expenditures. At a press conference in London last fall, NATO Secretary-General Joseph Luns, described the "Soviet threat" as follows: "The Soviet military machine is more threatening than it was six or seven years ago—on land, on sea, in the air and in nuclear capabilities."[2] *The Washington Post* wrote editorially that "NATO should modernise its forces and planning to counter the kind of brief and intense attack the Russians are now in a position to make."[3] Capitalist press reports and new broadcasts today about in this kind of provocative speculation or even worse. Those who would like to make capital of the "Soviet threat" use this bugbear to scare the peoples of Western Europe and the Middle East, and even those of Africa and Australia. The idea is to use the powerful imperialist machinery of "information" to implement their sinister plans.

One of the main centres co-ordinating and directing this campaign is the so-called Committee on the Present Danger, set up last November. It includes men who during the Vietnam war held key posts in the Johnson Administration and

were among the more strident zealots of escalating the conflict—Dean Rusk, former Secretary of State, Eugene Rostow, former Under-Secretary of State, Henry Fowler, former Secretary of the Treasury, Paul Nitze and David Packard, former deputy Secretaries of Defence. Among the organisers are Lane Kirkland, AFL-CIO Secretary-Treasurer, and other "hawks".[4] However, it has been obvious ever since the committee came into being that peddling myths about "dangerous Soviet policies"[5] is not its only aim. The group "will challenge President-elect Jimmy Carter and anybody else who tries to cut the US defence budget next year".[6]

That's the real purpose. Sure enough, the "hawks'" talk about a "Soviet threat"[7] is a demagogic device aimed at prevailing on the Democratic Administration that took over in January and on the US Congress to continue the arms build-up. The US intelligence agency's fantastic "disclosure" coincided with the submission by the outgoing Republican Administration of a record draft military budget of $123,000m. To put greater pressure on Congress and public opinion, the press widely publicised the fact that both the outgoing Defence Secretary, Donald Rumsfeld, and generals still holding high positions in the Pentagon were dissatisfied with even that huge amount and insisted on more.

The allegation that "the Soviet Union goes beyond what it needs for defence and that it seeks superiority in armaments to deliver a 'first strike'" was described as absurd and perfectly groundless by CPSU General Secretary Leonid Brezhnev in his Tula speech. On behalf of the CPSU and the Soviet people, he declared that the Soviet Union "will never take the road of aggression now draw the sword against other peoples".[8]

Meeting in plenary session to assess the results of the November 1976 elections, the CC CPUSA warned that the reactionary forces were already pressing President-elect Carter to continue the harmful policies which a majority of the electorate had repudiated.

The Carter Administration has declared that it plans to cut military spending and achieve further progress in the strategic arms limitation talks with the Soviet Union. Nor is it immaterial that most Americans who voted for Carter expect the new government to deal with the economic crisis and meet the people's pressing and long-neglected needs. This calls for a substantial reduction of arms appropriations so that funds can be rechannelled into satisfying the country's requirements.

Widespread public support for measures of this kind played a notable part in the Democrat's victory, and now it imposes definite obligations on the Carter Administration. During last year's election campaign, prominent Democrats promised the American public that if their party came to power it would put and end to covert day-to-day manipulation of the media.

These are all things that the militarists do not like. trying to counter-attack, they expect to block any cuts in military expenditures and, indeed, to have them increased. They also hope that by brainwashing the public they can discredit detente and the progress towards a crub on the arms race made through talks and bar the way to their successful conclusion.

One has only to look into the causes of reaction's manoeuvres to see that they are designed to neutralise mounting resistance to the military industrial complex. This resistance is bound to influence Congress, the municipalities and state authorities. Public concern over the arms race and over the "hawks'" increased

activity found expression in a draft [illegible] to the House of Representatives by more than 200 of its members. The draft stresses that the new government must back all steps to limit and prevent the proliferation of nuclear weapons and to continue the US—Soviet effort in this field.

It was no coincidence that delegates from various national organisations fighting for peace, disarmament and social reform arrived in Washington on Carter's inauguration day to remind him of his election promises. Participants in the campaign against the development of the new expensive B-1 bomber demonstrated in the capital and other cities. The Committee on American-Soviet Relations, composed of Eugene McCarthy, George Kennan, John K. Galbraith, Edwin Reischauer, Donald Kendall, Jerome Wiesner, Leonard Woodcock and other prominent public figures and scholars, released a statement that may be seen as an answer to the campaign launched by the Committee on the Present Danger. The statement demands an emphatic renunciation of the battered slogans and reflexes of the cold war period.

The "hawks'" challenge to the new Administration suggests that the struggle to preserve and further detente is intensifying in the United States. As for the American Communists, they stress the importance of uniting the people in struggle against the foes of detente and international security, for peace and the improvement of the American people's daily life.

---

[1] *US News & World Report*, January 17, 1977.

[2] *International Herald Tribune*, November 19, 1976.

[3] *The Washington Post*, November 17, 1976.

[4] "Paul Nitze, former deputy secretary of defence, who helped organise the committee," wrote *The Washington Post* (November 9, 1976) in one of its early reports on the committee, "said its objective is to achieve 'a clear understanding by the populace of what's going on' in the world as a result of Soviet expansionism."

[5] *International Herald Tribune*, November 10, 1976.

[6] Ibid.

[7] Operating on the same lines, the CIA on January 11 made public a report claiming that while the US spent only $90,000m. on defence annually, Soviet defence expenditures were greater by $30,000m. Yet the US Congress allocated the Pentagon $112,300m. for 1975/76. By contrast, the Supreme Soviet of the USSR has appropriated $17,200m. for defence under the 1977 budget. Commenting on the trend of CIA releases, the *Defence Monitor*, a bulletin published by the Washington Centre for Defence Information. Wrote with good reason that Congress and the American people were an object of the most intensive scare campaign since 1960 and that estimating Soviet military spending in dollars had nothing to do with what the Soviet Union actually spent on defence, and provided no basis for judging whether or not the US had adequate armed forces.

[8] *Pravda*, January 19, 1977.

The Working Class—National and International Tasks

RENE URBANY
Chairman, Communist Party of Luxembourg

HISTORY has proved correct the Marxist-Leninist conclusion that cyclical crises come and go while the general crisis remains a concomitant of capitalism in its last stage. What is new, is that today the capitalist economic crisis is characterised by an ever closer intertwining of the cyclical crisis with aspects of the general crisis. It is possible to speak, therefore, of a new stage in the postwar capitalist economy, and, compared with the high business activity of recent years, the situation will be different even if there is a production increase.

Such signs of the general capitalist crisis as the monetary crisis, inflation, the failure of neocolonialist strategy and the inter-imperialist contradictions have become more acute as a result of the constantly changing balance of world forces in favour of socialism. In the fifties imperialism could still place its hopes on a "rolling back" strategy and threatening socialist countries with war. But, as the socialist community, particularly the Soviet Union, gains in might (its share in world industrial output increased from 17 per cent in 1950 to 40 per cent in 1976), the confrontation between the two social systems is shifting to the ideological and economic spheres. While the socialist economy is continually on the upsurge, the capitalist crisis goes from bad to worse, its internal contradictions becoming more acute.

All this is likewise true for our country, where the economy is rapidly losing its stability and the population's social insecurity is growing. The politicians that only recently boasted of a "welfare society" are now attempting to prepare the younger generation for the prospect of constant unemployment. The working people are facing serious problems and are uneasy over the future which is anything but radiant. The 22nd Congress of the CPL (Dec. 26-27, 1976) pointed out that Luxembourg was on the verge of a long period of development with extreme contradictions and crises.

The first to be affected were the steel workers representing the country's key industry. The drop in production caused a sharp loss in wages and confronted the workers with a threat of unemployment. This situation is used by big capital to introduce modernisation on a broad scale by reducing jobs. Over a two-year period, 2,400 (over 10 per cent) jobs were liquidated in the industry while nationwide, according to trade union figures, approximately 9,000 jobs were liquidated as a result of the economic crisis. In this context the ARBED concern's joining the re-born German steel cartel is fraught with dire consequences. This concerns not only our economic and national independence. One of the cartel's main goals is to modernise the steel industry on an international scale and then start a mass lay-off.

Our Party warned of this danger. The Communist Parliamentary group tabled a government inquiry into the mass export of capital by the ARBED concern and demanded introduction of parliamentary control over investments in heavy

industry. A second inquiry concerned the German steel cartel. In early November last year the Communist Parties of Belgium, the FRG, France and Luxembourg met in our country to plan joint action against cartelisation of the steel industry.

The government sides with the powerful trusts and banks and all its important decisions on the crisis are intended to ensure heavy industry owners large state subsidies which the working people will have to pay. State aid to the steel magnates, declared as a means of maintaining full employment, in reality turned into a means of reducing employment. This is a characteristic trait of Luxembourg's state-monopoly capitalism.

Placing the country's finances in the hands of the big trusts reduces state social measures to mere handouts. Promised "big reforms" in retirement pensions and education remained promises, nothing was done to improve the outdated medicare system and there is still no state-financed housing construction.

The government's anti-social policy is likewise evident in the constantly increasing taxes. The budget for this year will see a 2.7 billion franc wage tax increase as against 1975. Ten years ago this tax accounted for only 18 per cent of government revenues, while last year it went up to 28 per cent. Together with the added value tax, which comes, for the most part, from the people's pockets, its share reaches 42 per cent. Meanwhile, the share of taxes on capitalist companies in overall revenues dropped from 17 to 11 per cent. One of the key demands in the struggle against shifting the burden of the crisis onto the working people is a fair distribution of taxes and a democratic tax system.

Depressing the working people's living standards and undermining their social gains simultaneously with a drastic curtailment of democratic rights is the general tendency of state-monopoly capitalism. One sign of this tendency is the encroachment on parliament's democratic prerogatives and traditions. The time of debate on the state budget has been cut by half, deputies have less time to state their points, while no time limit is set for ministers. This is done to prevent Communist deputies, above all, from criticising government policy in Parliament. It is regretable that all this is the work of a government that includes Socialists who declare now and again that they are for society's "democratisation".

It is time to stop curtailing the rights of deputies elected by popular vote, the Champer of Deputies must be guaranteed the right to effectively control the government and government agencies. For this the government must not be allowed to by-pass Parliament on the grounds of EEC decisions or "special powers". Another pressing task is a reform of the Council of State whose members are not elected and where the doors are closed to Communists. Not only its composition, but its functions also are indicative of its anti-democratic character. The communes must again be made independent.

In defending democratic rights it is important to oppose the "intelligence agency" whose main function, time has shown, is to supply information on progressive organisations, sabotage them and intimidate their membership. Public aversion to this spy department is so great that the congress of the largest workers' trade union, the Luxembourg General Confederation of Labour and the congress of the Socialist Workers' Party demanded its abolishment. But a similar motion tabled in Parliament by the Communists was seconded only by two Socialist deputies. Furthermore, the government intends to pass new legislation legalising this department and giving it greater powers.

Communists are well aware of the fact that defending and broadening democratic rights depends in large measure on preserving the country's sovereignty and independence, and that is why the Communist Party is decisively against foregoing our national rights in favour of supra-national institutes. Past experience has shown our position to be correct: capitalist integration, which means concentration of power in the hands of the big monopolies, is aimed against working class interests. Capitalist contradictions are not liquidated but made more acute, this worsens the economic crisis and inflation, increases unemployment and exploitation of the working people by the multinationals.

Creation under the wing of the EEC of the steel cartel, which FRG concerns intend using to establish their economic and political domination in Western Europe, has shown the dangers to our national independence caused by concentration of international capital. We have good reason to resist the formation of a supra-national state through a universally elected European Parliament. Such projects are based on the intention to preserve at all costs thie bankrupt capitalist system in Western Europe. It is believed that a supranational regime will, more effectively than a national government, be able to oppose the working class and the growing resistance of the masses. That is why we insist that all legislation in Luxembourg should be passed by Parliament and approved by the deputies elected by and accountable to the people.

Under the slogan of "national solidarity", an offensive has been launched against the people's living standards and social gains. The population is told that the only way out of the crisis is through "co-ordinated action" by the employers, government and trade unions while spokesmen for big capital are grouped with "the nation's vital forces". This is a crude deception. The working people's gains and social rights can be ensured not by friendly co-operation with employers, but through a decisive struggle against big capital and its politicians. United action by workers and employees against the crisis policy of employers and government is the genuine solidarity that our country needs. Recent events are proof of this. A big protest demonstration in the capital on December 18 in which all trade unions took part, demanded guaranteed employment, maintaining the purchasing power, and defence of the working people's social gains. Many of these demands coincide with what Communists have for long been fighting for.

The demonstration, an important step towards joint action by the trade unions, was aimed against the employers and the policy of the government coalition. This shows that the shifts in our country's policy following the 1974 Parliamentary elections have not brought about radical changes. And there were great hopes for such change when, after a half-century rule by the Christian-Social Party it was replaced by the Socialist Workers' Party and Democratic Party coalition. Communists have always warned against harbouring any such illusions. It soon became clear that the new coalition would not venture beyond a few timid and long overdue juridical reforms, but would ensure the continuity of pro-capitalist policies. As the crisis increased, it became evident that the pseudo-progressive composition of the new government and its influence among the unions would be used by big capital to preserve "social peace", shift the burden of the crisis onto the working people and reduce their social gains and democratic rights still more.

The purpose of the "joint management", introduced at large factories, is likewise becoming clear. Today many workers realise that the union spokesmen

sitting on the boards of large companies and the creation of mixed committees at enterprises does not mean that the working people really have a say in management. All key decisions are manoeuvred in such a way as to catch the workers' reprsentatives unawares and place them before a *fait accompli*. The questions discussed by this "joint management" are kept secret and are not to be discussed with the workers. This allows the management to hold the representatives responsible for any trouble at the enterprise, compromise them before the workers and so split the working people and the unions. Such "joint management" is nothing but a ruse by the employers.

Communists must expose these manoeuvres and fight for genuine worker-control, for joint management that would allow the working class to influence decisions, particularly those concerning profits and investments of big companies. Genuine worker participation in management is possible in our country only by radically changing the balance of political forces.

Our last congress has shown that Communists cannot close their eyes to real problems, avoid decisions on crucial issues as certain other parties do. Because Communists stand firmly on the principles of a scientific world outlook and, being the working class vanguard, they carry tremendous responsibility, and concrete solutions and a clear-cut position are expected of them, whatever the circumstances.

The Communist Party is convinced that a democratic way out of the crisis that has affected all spheres of life in the country is anti-monopoly struggle which would lead to a new situation in society, profound democratic reform and would open the way to socialism. There can be no social progress unless the working class and other democratic forces fight for socio-economic interests, democratic rights and for peace. It is in such struggle that a class awareness and organisation are formed, so necessary to radically shift the balance of political forces and carry out social changes.

Our Party's efforts helped to create conditions for a genuine left alliance the need for which is widely realised. Participation of Socialists in the bourgeois government, where they are repeating the bitter mistakes of the past has never prevented us from stressing the need of co-operating with them for common goals. Communists and Socialists co-operate in the trade unions and, in some cases, at communal level in the framework of municipal coalitions. Problems arise, of course, but despite a difference in positions on certain issues, this co-operation has yielded good results and furthered our country's progressive development. We are certain that co-operation on a national scale between Communists, Socialists and other democratic forces is today a political alternative.

It is important to point out that unity for us is not an end in itself, but a means to better defend the working people's interests and speed up social and democratic progress. Co-operation with other political forces does not mean that Communists forego their fundamental principles, nor do they expect their partners to forego theirs. Therefore, Communists would not endorse a policy that shifts the burden of the crisis onto the workers and preserves monopoly profits and power. An alliance of left forces will make sense only if it is anti-monopoly. It must serve as a prerequisite for an effective struggle against big capital, for democracy and socialism. While advocating co-operation with other segments of the population, we, nevertheless, are a working-class party and this

underlies all our activities. With the working-class and for the working class is the slogan of the Communist Party of Luxembourg.

The action programme of the Communists and the Party programme which the Socialists pidgeonholed when they entered the government have many points in common: greater participation in management, broader democratic and social gains, up-to-date systems of education and medicare, a progressive solution to the environmental problem. A joint Communist-Socialist programme could include such pressing issues as providing employment and effective parliamentary and trade union control over investment. As the concentration of big West European capital continues and more manufacturing capacities are moved to other countries, the need arises to nationalise the steel industry. This is an extremely important national question since the country's economic structures are in danger. Nationalisation of power engineering is another urgent issue.

Effective efforts to defend the working peoples' interests, a way out of the crisis and new steps towards social progress, are possible only if the political situation in the country changes radically and the power of the large trusts and banks is greatly reduced. To achieve this there must be political co-operation of the left forces which is possible only if the Socialist Party stops co-operating with the big bourgeoisie, returns to consistent class positions, and resumes its activity as a workers' party.

Anti-communism is the greatest obstacle to the unity of the working people, of all progressive and democratic forces. This classical bourgeois and reactionary means of preventing working class unity is, regretably, also used by Socialist leaders who still reject the idea of co-operation with Communists. Our Party is constantly accused of not being a "national" party and of "obeying instructions from Moscow". Efforts are made to show that our solidarity with the Soviet Union, the CPSU and the other fraternal parties of the socialist community contradict the Party's national policy. Many times the bourgeois parties and Socialists have suggested that we dissociate ourselves from the USSR, the CPSU and existing socialism to prove our "independence" and to merit recognition as being worthy of becoming part of the capitalist system. Our opponents even assure us that in this case the influence of the Communist Party would increase among the masses (as if our opponents are interested in this).

Though the anti-communist and anti-Soviet campaigns are spreading and numerous ventures are made to force us off our Marxist-Leninism positions in the national and international class struggle, Luxembourg's Communists declared at their last congress that they would not retreat a step from the principles or proletarian internationalism and international solidarity of the Communist and workers' movement.

Our Party's fifty-year history, has been a period of hard and selfless struggle. During the fascist years many Communists, true patriots dedicated to the working class cause, gave their lives, languished in prison and concentration camp, and fought in the Resistance. Proof of the Communist Party's national character is its devotion to national sovereignty which today is consistently defended only by this party.

Today, as in the past, the Communist Party of Luxembourg draws up its programme and plans its activities freely and independently in accordance with the country's specifics and traditions, our people's interests and the

determination of the working class to attain democracy, peace and socialism.

We have always been inspired by our faith in the strength of proletarian internationalism and socialism's just cause which triumphed with the victory of the Great October Socialist Revolution. Is it possible that today, when existing socialism has proved its supremacy and is firmly in possession of the historical initiative, we could betray it for praise from the anti-Communist forces whose system is on the verge of bankruptcy? Is it possible that we would dissociate ourselves from the socialist community of nations—the greatest achievement of more than 100 years' struggle of the international revolutionary workers' movement—just to be "recognised" by the bourgeoisie and its bankrupt politicians?

The sincere friendship and solidarity binding us with the CPSU and the fraternal parties of other socialist countries is fully in the interests of our working class and our people. Thanks to the might and the peaceful policy of the Soviet Union and its socialist allies it has been possible not only to avoid a new world war, but to lay the foundations of a lasting peace, security and co-operation of nations, of the peaceful coexistence of states with differing social systems. This is vitally important to our people, for were it not for the mighty socialist camp imperialism would long ago have turned to war as a traditional means of settling crises. And our people, too, would have been plunged into the abyss of misery.

The socialist states afford us the opportunity, while fully preserving our national sovereignty, of broadening trade with them and establishing economic, scientific, technical and cultural co-operation. Our close relations and friendship are on a much higher plane than what is preached by our "European" politicians who are selling out our national sovereignty and freedom in the supra-national institutes, are subjugating the country's economic interests to the interests of the West German concerns and are sinking the country ever deeper in crisis.

We are well aware that it is no simple matter to build socialism and communism and that new problems constantly arise before the socialist countries. But we are equally aware that these problems are resolved in the interests of the working people as is seen in the steady improvement of all spheres of the economy, science, and social and cultural life.

The extension of democracy that accompanies this is based on such working class gains as social confidence, employment, the right to education, guaranteed rights for the youth and women and democratic participation in all spheres of life, particularly the economy. Such are the basic values of socialism that ensure genuine freedom for the working people. Such are the values which the working people in a capitalist society do not enjoy, despite the high rate of production in the fifties and sixties and despite the relatively high average consumption of material goods.

The plans of the anti-communists, who are stepping up their campaign of slander and provocations against the socialist countries taking full advantage of the entire capitalist media, are no secret to us. They would like to isolate the Communists and the workers from the main force in the struggle to change the world in the direction of democracy, national independence, detente and socialism. In the worsening capitalist crisis they intend to distract the working people's attention from the socialist example of crisis-free development and prevent united action for social reforms.

We would be rendering our Party and the working class a disservice if we

~~ ~~ pressures of the mounting slander campaign against the Soviet Union and other socialist countries, if we agreed, at the price of dissociating ourselves from existing socialism, to prove our independence, or to win the praise of the bourgeois and petty-bourgeois parties. On the contrary, we must increase our fight against anti-communism and popularise still more the great achievements and significance of existing socialism.

For us, Communists, a clear-cut stand in relation to existing socialism is a prerequisite of an effective struggle in the interests of our own working class. That is why our Party's policy continues standing for greater solidarity and unity with the socialist world. No matter how malicious the attacks or slander aimed at us, Ernst Thalmann's words, "the attitude towards the Soviet Union is what determines the true face of a revolutionary", remain true for us to this day.

In this same spirit our Party is working to consolidate the unity of the world Communist movement. In our struggle we find inspiration and support in the fact that we are marching side by side with millions of Communists from all countries, that we are an active *contingent of the international Communist and anti-imperialist movement*, which today is the mightiest and most decisive force of progress on earth.

The Party and Its Cadres

ERKKI KIVIMÄKI
Politbureau member, CP Finland

THE cadres policy is an integral part of the Party's general political line. Life and experience have shown that without a planned and effective cadres policy, the Party is deprived of crucial subjective prerequisites for purposeful, organised and effective work. Lenin pointed out: "Not a single class in history has achieved power without producing its political leaders, its prominent representatives able to organise a movement and head it" (Coll. Works, Vol. 4, p. 370).

The character of the Communist Party of Finland as a Marxist-Leninist, revolutionary Party of the working class whose goal is to lead the working class and its allies to social revolution and to build a new, socialist society, determines the foundations of the CPF's cadres policy. Some of its traits, however, are connected with the specifics of the struggle at its present stage.

As the capitalist crisis increases, the Communist Party plays an increasing role in settling urgent social problems. Because of its special responsibility and its role in the present-day class struggle, it should be able to offer the working class and all working people a concrete alternative to bourgeois policy. That is why now more than ever before, there is an urgent need for cadres capable of profoundly analysing the concrete situation, comparing our problems with the problems of the working people in other capitalist countries, cadres familiar with the conclusions to be drawn in this connection and with the experience of fraternal parties in similar circumstances and able to formulate concrete proposals on this basis. In other words, there is a greater demand than ever for substantiated views on the ways, forms and methods of struggle which could lead the working class to victory. And this is one of today's key demands. Cadres policy today is also

shaped by the growing role of mass movements, expanding co-operation between the Communist and other workers' parties. Proposals for the programme of co-operation with democratic forces were discussed and adopted by the 17th Congress of the CP Finland. Its fulfilment requires the Party's firm ideological consistency and good organisation, and this demands on the cadres above all.

New opportunities are opening up for us in the cadres policy and new problems arise, making this work particularly important.

We believe that choice of cadres is primarily a political task and we therefore try to show maximum consideration for the level of political knowledge and practical experience of Communists, their devotion, discipline, inclinations and ability to work with the people, their attitude towards the collective.

We consider primary organisations an indispensable school of ideological and organisational work and strive to have them play a greater role in our work, encourage rank-and-file Communists to be more active and promote Party activists and leaders from their midst.

The situation with cadres in these organisations has improved of late. But there is still a shortage of experienced and able Party workers. This is not because our Party lacks capable and serious Communists. Possibly, it is just that abilities are not always noticed, remaining in the background. Leadership of the primary organisations is not always sufficiently concrete and systematic. At times district organisations deal with problems in isolation from them. This does not mean that they take no part in analysing one or another problem, but they are still not sufficiently involved. The result is that some of them tend to sit and wait for instructions "from above", thus breeding a passive attitude, restraining independent action. We are trying to change all this.

It is important to break through Party cell exclusiveness and isolation from their environment. The Communist Party of Finland is centering its attention on improving the work of these organisations by having them rely more on the masses and by encouraging initiative. Growing influence of these organisations among the masses depends in large measure on how effective their work is, on the opportunities they afford to influence the course of events and achieve concrete results. We aim for each Communist to be fully aware of this.

Cadres in district organisations are chosen and trained with care. The quality and quantity of Party functionaries on the district level has improved. Work in district committees is good experience for Communists and encourages some to continue their training. We realise that all problems cannot be solved by Party functionaries alone. The number of leading cadres should be trained and enlarged in line with the tasks facing us. One well established method is to create temporary commissions and groups to fulfil concrete tasks on a district and Central Committee level. In this way it is possible to entrust new, young Party members with various tasks, thereby testing their abilities and, from the viewpoint of specialisation, to make better use of cadres.

The recent CPF proposals on the programme for co-operation of the democratic forces are characteristic of such work. The groups that dealt with this included members of the Party leadership and specialists from various enterprises and firms, not all of them Communists. The groups were subdivided into sectors, each dealing with a specific problem and then all the proposals were brought together. Material on housing policy was prepared in a similar way. At

present a group is preparing an analysis of the rightist danger in Finland.

This method improves our analysis, attracts new forces, expands our knowledge and helps us to draw up the best possible programme of action.

It is clear that there must be specialisation of Party cadres depending on the problems they deal with. There are difficulties, however, for the shortage of resources does not allow a rational allocation of duties in the Central Committee and in district organisations. The shortage of personnel in the district committee makes this a particularly difficult problem and they are forced to be "jacks of all trades"—organisers, propagandists, etc. There is also a discrepancy between the demand and practical use of cadres: although there is a shortage of trained personnel, they are not always used to best advantage. It also happens that not always the best candidates are sent to study and, therefore, specialised training is not always used to best advantage from the viewpoint of the Party's requirements and activities. The situation on the whole is such that as yet we are unable to provide all sectors with trained and experienced cadres (though when Communists lacking special education are sent to a new job we strive to give them the necessary training). Specialisation of Party cadres is our goal, and the problem is being resolved.

There is yet another problem, and this is co-operation between the older and younger Party cadres. Our apparatus and organisational network were created, *in the main, immediately after the war when it was no longer necessary for the* Party to remain underground. Our membership increased greatly at that time, but during the cold war and discrimination against Communists, not many young people joined the Party capable of replacing older members. This created something of a vacuum. Although later membership started growing again, the influx of young people had its good and bad sides. The older members were able to distinguish between what the youth introduced that was useful for the Party and what could be discarded. But, the older cadres became over-suspicious of the new. I, for one, believe that many of our difficulties today are the result of not being able to choose correctly between the useful and the useless several years ago. This of course, affected our cadres policy.

In placing cadres our requirements were far too high and went beyond the realistic possibilities, at least as concerned education and experience. We favoured "previous experience" and this meant selecting persons already in executive positions while underestimating the abilities of younger Party members thus forming an "exclusive circle" of cadres where the same persons were continually shifted from one post to another (while their number inside the "circle" gradually dwindled).

Today, we are making headway in producing an alloy of initiative, youth radicalism and veteran experience and discretion. In large measure this depends on the relations established between Communists in their work, their readiness to help each other and the general atmosphere among the membership. It is not enough to be politically knowledgeable and competent. One must be able to convey one's knowledge to others.

We constantly stress the need of training new members and improving the qualification of older members. The rate of social progress presumes a constantly expanding knowledge and improving methods of work in order not to be left in the wake of events and no longer being able to help carry out the Party line. We likewise try to differentiate our Marxist-Leninist studies depending on the

preparedness and requirements of various age groups [illegible] earlie prejudices and mistrust in relations between older and younger Party member are gradually disappearing. One reason for this is that the progressive younge generation is forming a correct picture of the working class and the Communis Party, of their place and role in the development of society, particularly, in regard to the interests of the youth. More and more they are becoming aware that the basic issues of the class struggle are common to young and old Party members alike, although each generation has its specific problems.

The tasks of the anti-imperialist struggle, the formation of a united and democratic front, the efforts to change the direction of the domestic economic policy, questions of wages, prices, taxes, etc., unite various generations in common action. We do not forget, however, that forms of struggle must be found making it possible to work for the specific interests of different generations.

The Party tries to combine the experience of Party functionaries with that of Communists working at enterprises, the Party's activities at factories and the training of cadres for this. Through its cadres the Party co-operates with young workers and students, with their organisations and particularly with those who apply Marxist-Leninist principles in their activity. The trade unions offer a wide field for political and ideological activity for in recent years hundreds of thousands of young people have joined the unions which themselves have become more active. Besides dealing with wages and labour conditions, they are also involved in international and domestic socio-political affairs, particularly economic policy and greater democratic rights. Communists in the trade union movement now require special ideological and political training so important for correct leadership.

More and more often Communists are elected worker's delegates, labour protection officers and union executives. We are working to democratise our trade unions and are using a more democratic system of choosing cadres for work in the unions. Although we have attained a measure of success, there still exists a bias against Communists. Consequently we are working to end such prejudice in employing personnel for government jobs and in the municipalities, the progressive co-operative movement, the widely developed workers' sports movement and elsewhere.

In all these questions we find that we must improve guidance of Communists whom the Party delegates for work in other organisations. Although it is these persons who are the vehicles of the Party's ideological influence among the masses, their contacts and required knowledge are still insufficient.

Previously, there was greater centralisation in our work with cadres. But as the membership and our need for a wider selection of Party workers increased, we found that our personnel department alone was no longer capable of correctly and fully carrying out our cadres policy. Obviously, cadres policy is an important part of the activity of every Party Central Committee. However, as the need for specialisation and a deeper division of labour in Party organs increases, there is a greater demand for over-all planning and programming of work in order that all aspects of Party activity are effectively tied in with the general strategy and tactics. It becomes necessary to co-ordinate cadres policy in various spheres of activity in order to correctly choose and train cadres on a planned basis. Although we are all for collective leadership this does not and cannot mean lifting of personnel responsibility.

[illegible] and cadres policy are closely linked together. Ideological and political unity is indispensable for a unified cadres policy, presupposing absolute fulfilment of Lenin's principles of Party life, equality of all Communists. If these are lacking, it could mean mistakes in cadres policy, and a negative affect on people and their co-operation. In that case personal contacts could prevail over an analytical and businesslike approach, weaken Party work and erode its *position on specific issues, on individual or group interests.*

A cadres policy must take account of the Party's general interests. Our 17th Congress stressed the importance of correct application of the principle of democratic centralism and collectivism in cadres policy and also of consolidating trust and equality among Communists. To encourage some while discriminating against others is harmful and alien to a Marxist-Leninist Party and may lead to disillusionment. Practical co-operation, collective discussions of all problems help Communists identify themselves with the common cause and promote a conscious acceptance of Party policy.

It is also important to give attention to unifying factors, to clarifying possible differences in an open and comradely manner. The common cause will not profit by covering up shortcomings and mistakes, nor by deliberately seeking out faults. This does not strengthen unity and consolidation of Party cadres. Businesslike criticism and self-criticism, on the other hand, cement the Party's Marxist-Leninist foundation and its political and organisational unity. We know from experience that strict principles should be accompanied by discretion, businesslike approach, fairness and reasonable patience. Unity and co-operation presuppose a businesslike atmosphere, readiness for objective discussion and a free exchange of views without the fear of being "stigmatised".

Our education work has grown in scope, with all its forms developing parallel. to the much increased interest in socialism and Marxism-Leninism. Our membership attends study circles, seminars and courses. There are district and neighbourhood Party schools, and a higher educational establishment functioning on a Marxist-Leninist basis. A good deal of attention is given to self-education of Communists and correspondence courses.

Our education work has grown inscope, with all its forms developing parallel. The number of circles in primary organisations has increased and this form of education is prevailing. The work of district and neighbourhood schools has improved. Evening schools in many central regions offer a wide range of subjects. In some districts the Party schools aim to ensure training of the entire *aktiv* within the next few years. We attach importance to training Party activists at the factories. Our lecture work and seminars at various levels has increased.

Besides theory, we also strive to give practical instruction in methods of Party work. In this respect we gain from studying the experience of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries.

Our goal is a unified and differentiated system of Party education. This means that besides developing various forms of study, there will be special programmes and textbooks for each and they will complement each other.

In our monthly political and theoretical journal *Kommunisti* we try to cover questions, pertaining to the Party's activities from Marxist-Leninist positions and with due account of concrete demands of the struggle. *World Marxist Review* also helps in our work with the cadres, for it provides us with a broad coverage of the experience of fraternal parties. Equally helpful is our co-

operation with the Communists of [illegible] joint seminars, lectures, etc. Particularly important in such co-operation are the materials and literature prepared for Party studies.

The new objective factors of social development are helping to consolidate the positions of the CP Finland. These are the relaxation of international tensions, the growing co-operation between Finland and the Soviet Union and other socialist countries, the weakening of anti-Communist positions in our own country and the growing recognition by the masses of our Party's position and significance. *In these conditions, its ideological and organisational firmness and its growing prestige among the masses depend in large measure on the Party's correct cadres policy.*

The Lessons of Chile

*Third Article**

Psychological Warfare: A Political Weapon of Imperialism

RODRIGO ROJAS
Political Commission Member, CC Communist Party of Chile

THE very fact that Chile is living under a fascist regime shows that imperialism stops at nothing to stave off a threat to its interests. The Chilean experience, as well as impelling us to make a careful and constructive study of problems of the revolution, leads us to the conclusion that we must make a careful study of the political arsenal of imperialism and reaction.

This article attempts an analysis of only one aspect of the subject—psychological warfare as a political weapon of imperialism—and examines from this point of view what happened in Chile.

Democratic rights and freedoms are admittedly a major factor for the development of the class struggle. The working class champions democratic development. The very existence of democratic rights for the people in capitalist countries today is conditional on how successfully the workers fight against imperialism, on the concessions which the ruling classes are forced to make to the working class and its allies. When the issue of reorganising society on revolutionary lines comes to the fore reaction uses every means at its disposal against the democratic rights won by the workers.

In Chile there developed a situation in which the democratic rights of the overwhelming majority of the people could no longer be preserved, let alone extended, without stopping abuses of these rights on the part of a reactionary minority. The forces intent on installing fascist rule launched a psychological terror campaign through the mass media to pave the way for military terror. With the campaign gaining momentum and the fascist conspiracy unfolding, propaganda and physical terror merged into one. That these two forms of terror were not stopped in time was a sign of our weakness, as events revealed.

In an open letter to President Salvador Allende of Chile on August 29, 1972, Luis Corvalan, General Secretary of the Communist Party of Chile, stated the

* See *WMR*, January and February 1977.

...recognition of the rights of the opposition ...uld not lead us to accept every kind of excess or misdeed. Some opposition ...kesmen think the law can be twisted at will. There are opposition papers and ...adcasting stations which have made lies, insult, slander, false and alarmist ...orts their daily bread.... Our first and foremost duty to the people and the ...intry is to put a straightjacket on those who want to drag Chile into a ...odbath. The need to maintain and assure the development of freedom and ...nocracy binds us to use the law against those who resort to crimes with an eye bringing down the government and setting up a fascist dictatorship."[1]

Developments proved this position correct. Furthermore, there is new ...dence indicating that the propaganda machinery of Chilean reaction did not merely pursue propaganda aims but waged a psychological war preparatory to an armed struggle against the people.

The Chilean experience also shows that in exporting methods and techniques of this kind of warfare, imperialism tries in each particular case to represent them as a purely national or local matter. Yet it is manifest that the reaction-controlled media performed their part according to a "script" written by experts of the CIA and other subversive agencies of US imperialism. We find the fundamentals of this "script" in *Psychological Operations,* a manual brought out by the US war department.

Claiming that "peace today ... is a continuation of the war by non-military means", the manual describes "psychological propaganda, or psychological operations", as the principal means of this nature now in use.[2] These were planned and put into effect to influence the sentiments, attitudes or behaviour of people in other countries in a manner "favourable to the success of US policies and objectives". The purpose of psychological war, the manual notes, is to generate despondency, defeatism and apathy, encourage people to put their personal interest above the public interest and heighten their interest in private life so as to reduce their support of collective or national aims, foment skepticism regarding the political aims and ideology of the local or central authority (if these are hostile to US intentions), discord, dissent and strife, increase disarray and confusion in people's behaviour, and incite them to violent anti-social actions so as to undermine the political structure of the country and encourage resistance movements against authority.

Precepts and recommendations of this nature were used most zealously in Chile. The psychological war served to aggravate the country's serious economic problems, set the middle strata of society against the working-class movement, bring about an alliance between these strata and the big bourgeoisie on the basis of imperialist policy and establish the hegemony of financial capital in the political leadership of the counter-revolution. Reaction strove through psychological pressure to drive a wedge between the government and certain sectors of the popular movement and to foment discord in it by publicising the ultra-leftists' provocative and objectively counter-revolutionary concepts and actions. By taking advantage of the class character of the army and the fact that imperialist influence in its ranks had grown, reaction also strove to achieve in and outside the army a balance of forces that would help to move it away from the popular government, disregard the military's celebrated professionalism, "indifference" to politics and respect for civilian authority and involve them in the dirty business of a coup and crimes against the people.

[illegible] group
the ruling classes, with the activity of all the power [illegible] in their han
which led to a veritable institutional siege of the Popular Unity government a
tended to become an obstacle to the exercise of power.

The Chilean experience has shown that psychological pressure is brought t
bear by such traditional means as the cinema, television, the radio or the pre
plus such unseemly ones as gossip, rumour and intrigues. The idea is that at
time of social upheaval rumour and gossip begin to live a life of their own as
were, acquire a dynamic quality and, spreading through society like a maligna
tumour, stimulate an irrational behaviour among the masses and create a
explosive situation.

Reaction uses terror as the main "supplement" to psychological pressur
Although the policy of intimidation is neither omnipotent nor reliabl
imperialism and its allies contrived to exploit it, causing fear and arousing hatre
among certain sections of the population and directing these sentiments again
the popular movement and the government formed by it. In an atmosphere o
violence, which is only natural during a revolution, many are understandabl
gripped by fear. This sentiment also motivates the one-time ruling classe
removed from power. Imperialism cunningly uses this situation by exploitin
primarily anti-Communist prejudices instilled from generation to generation. I
other words, it begins to implement a policy of intimidation primarily toward
its own allies, seeing it as a means of intensifying class sentiments, causing unre
among the bourgeoisie and helping it to consolidate. This means that the purpos
of the policy of intimidation at its early stage is to evolve definite forms o
defending class interests so as to go over to outright anti-Communist aggressio
later on, when fear turns into hatred.

The policy of intimidation is also used against the working class and its mos
trustworthy allies. Imperialism, well knowing that this policy cannot make th
politically mature section of the people change its ideological position (a
numerous experiments have revealed), concentrates on measures to dampen th
working people's militancy and undermine their confidence in leaders.
Psychological pressure was meant to breed discord and disunity among th
workers, divide them and reduce them to passivity. The mistakes and weaknesse
of the popular movement itself were skilfully used as an objective factor. The
ultra-leftists' action against the small and middle proprietors and the popular
government, their vain appeals to the armed forces and their "leftists" talk were
used in the psychological war (irrespective of the intensions of the "leftist"
groups' leaders).

However, the main target of the policy of intimidation from the class point of
view was the middle strata, in particular groups of the petty proprietor-minded
bourgeoisie. Imperialism used psychological terror as a means of creating an
uneasy social situation and exploiting people's innate, most atavistic sentiments.

Psychological pressure was also exerted on such social institutions as the
family, whose image had not yet been "tarnished" by traditional bourgeois
policy. To be sure, this applied to vacillating population groups, to those who
had refused to support the Popular Unity programme and were likely to side with
the opposition. They were made to understand that each family should become a
centre of anti-popular agitation and organisation and that they all should unite
on the platform of an aggressive anti-Communist class policy. Women with a

were expected not to dissuade men from engaging in ...itics, as they usually did, but to join in such activity and become zealous ...vocates of bourgeois policies.

The result was a volteface in the attitude of certain sections of the bourgeoisie ...d the middle strata to the family, to women and children. An organisation ...lled Women's Power was formed as a proponent of allegedly feminist policy. ...e experience of Cuban women belonging to the bourgeoisie, who had ...monstrated in mourning dress in protest against the Revolutionary ...overnment under Fidel Castro, as well as the experience of the "pots and pans ...arches" of *bourgeois women against Joao Goulart in Brazil* was exported to ...ile and became a major manifestation of "civil disobedience" to the Allende ...vernment. Reactionary propaganda and rumour made out women to be more ...urageous and determined than men, thereby goading men into militant anti-...ommunist activity.

The shortest path to any mother's heart was linked with her desire to give her ...ildren an education and take care of their health and safety. Reaction gambled ... this in the most shameless manner. Popular Unity spokesmen and Marxists ...ere portrayed as people, opposing children to parents. A *Mercurio*[3] ad ...splayed a photograph of a student and beside it, that of an armed man in a ...lourful "guerrilla' uniform. The caption read: "Your son—or your enemy?" ...d to drive the idea home, the ad said: "In socialist countries, children are made ... spy on their parents." Another ad reproduced an execution. "This is ...mmunism," the caption told the reader. Printed below it in capital letters were ...e words "Do you want that for Chile? Save Chile from communism!" Radio ...oadcasts harped on the same tune—you heard the rattle of a tommy-gun, the ...ice of a woman shrieking: "The Communists have killed my son!" and the ...nouncer's voice saying: "This could happen in Chile if Chile were ...ommunist." Parents were urged to protect their children: "Don't let them play ...tdoors", "Take them to school and back".

At the same time, reaction frankly combined psychological terror with ...fective class organisation. The call "Chileans, unite in anger" became the main ...tchword of the time, repeated with inane persistance. A sizeable section of the ...ddle strata and the big bourgeoisie was instigated to form organisations that ...uld foment economic chaos, terror and social anarchy.

To this end, use was made of methods that had "proved thier worth". The ...pulation was egged on through endless telephone calls, written notices and ...mours passed on from family to family to buy large quantities of food and use ...e black market because goods would soon "disappear" or "cost more". People ...ere provoked into forming queues. Necessities and other consumer goods were ...arded. Things went so far as dumping large quantities of baby foods, milk, ...edicines, and so on, into dustbins or rivers. All this aroused popular discontent, ... course. But the blame was put on the government and the revolution. ...*ychological Operations* says: "Put the blame on those in power.... ...opaganda is more likely to succeed in an atmosphere of social unrest."

Questionnaires said to come from Popular Unity were distributed among the ...ddle strata of town and countryside. They included questions on how many ...drooms and beds you had and what household utensils, and whether you were ...lling to share your homes and property with fellow-Chileans.

And when people gave in to fear they were instigated to form "self-defence"

units at the level of street, neighbourhood or district. This work was [illegible] carried on by retired servicemen, which guaranteed the paramilitary organisations concerned a high standard and, on the other hand, gave the "self-defence" measures a military and "patriotic" semblance. Headlines like "Santiago Encircled" or "MIRists Besiege Wealthy Districts" were carried along with maps of civilian communities or military areas allegedly "freed" or "saved" MIR "seizures". Children were made to set up liaison systems, telephones codes were invented and whistles made that gave a definite signal. Full-scale operational manoeuvres were held to build up fear and hostility and stimulate conspiratorial activities among other social sectors, such as the trade unions, the liberal professions, student federations and fascist-like military men. Specialists were used to set up communications and build trenches and field hospitals. The overall purpose was to create a climate of mass hysteria. The campaign was backed up with acts intended to raise panic, such as interruptions in water supply, protracted light "failures" in wealthy neighbourhoods and at military posts or broadcasts calling on audiences "to stay calm and not to give in to extremist provocation".

"Self-defence" measures were accompanied by more and more acts of open aggression: terroristic attempts on people's lives (there were 105 dangerous attempts between June 1972 and February 1973, with 17 Popular Unity activists killed); strikes by transport employees, shopkeepers and members of the professions; strikes by the management of copper mines appointed by imperialists and still in charge, and bourgeois movements of "solidarity" with the strikers; the seizure of an occasional educational institution under reactionary influence; "pots and pans concerts", demonstrations, rallies and reactionary marches; broadcasts by bourgeois-controlled stations assailing the government; the building of barricades and the organisation of riots in wealthy neighbourhoods, down-town districts of the capital and other cities, and so on.

It must be noted, however, that for all the efforts of imperialism, class-conscious workers kept out of anti-government actions.

The slanderous propaganda campaign of reaction combined fear, hatred and illusions about a "democratic way out" allegedly making it possible to "rebuild Chile", and urged the overthrow of President Allende. Specifically, ads said: "Women of Chile, we cannot wait till 1976 because in the next four years communism will fully establish a dictatorship of hunger. We must replace the Marxist government without delay."

Reactionary propaganda, misrepresenting those in power, spread rumours about discord within Popular Unity and the government and described the Allende government as an "oppresor" of the people. With this aim in view, it exploited every ultra-leftist, in particular MIR, outbreak. *El Mercurio* did not carry a single interview with a government spokesman but repeatedly made whole pages available to MIR leaders, who did not attack reaction but government measures and vented their fury above all on the Communist Party.

To oppose the people to the government, reaction played up the ultra-leftists' untenable economic demands and their calls for a "revolutionary pole" opposed to the government. When arguing that the country was headed for "anarchy" owing to government activity, reaction alleged that President Allende took his cue from the ultra-leftists. But when accusing the government of

'totalitarianism", it imputed to Popular Unity all the negative characteristics of he MIR.

The US war department's recommendations give a clear idea of how mperialism plans disruption of the unity of popular forces. "When you cannot ıttack directly," its manual says, "use insinuations. Increase frictions and try to rovoke disunity. . . stimulate dissent and internal conflicts, foment distrust and uspicion."

Besides, reactionary propaganda always tried to discredit those in power and nterpreted their personal qualities in its own way. It never hesitated to fling gross nsults at President Allende, resort to outright blackmail, use fake photographs, ınd so on. This method of psychological warfare, too, was exported by US mperialism.

The psychological war and its results had a direct impact on the armed forces ınd the civilian "cordon sanitaire" surrounding them. Interruptions in food upply, economic chaos, the terror campaign going on in bourgeois ıeighbourhoods and at troop and carabinero stations, the formation of "self-defence" units, the atmosphere of uncertainty and the psychological manipulation of families increased the ferment among the military and its civilian surrounding. Such factors as the institutional war in parliament and in judicial and supervisory agencies, massive attacks by reactionary propaganda, 'evidence" of the "unlawfulness" of the government, which was alternately charged with "anarchy" and "totalitarianism", had a strong impact on the armed orces. There were also the actions of reactionary politicians and the wives of ascist-minded army officers, who made "psychological attacks" on patriotic officers by accusing them of lack of courage, and so forth. In exerting psychological pressure on the armed forces, recourse was also had to the provocative activity of the ultra-leftists, in particular of the MIR, with its ınrestrained bragging.

Imperialism saw the main purpose of these activities, as has been said, in ılienating the armed forces from the popular government and isolating patriotic commanders devoted to the Constitution from their units and the officer corps vhile at the same time inciting the military to carry out a coup.

The struggle against imperialism, and the world revolutionary process as a vhole, is making steady progress. The development of the socialist countries, their growing power and the increasing influence of their foreign policy attract the attention of ever larger sections of the population of capitalist and developing countries. The impact of socialist ideas and the effect of the revolutionising example of existing socialism are growing especially in the context of the deep crisis besetting the whole capitalist system. In a desperate and fruitless attempt to find a way out of this crisis, imperialism and the forces upholding the interests of multinational monopolies use their last trump card—fascism. We do not intend to look into the intricacies of fascist ideology but in view of the problems we are analysing, we would like to call attention to certain circumstances brought out by the Chilean experience.

A *sine qua non* of reaction's every psychological manipulation was to distort reality in the people's eyes. This resulted in certain population groups coming to believe imperialist falsehoods. To quote *Psychological Operations*, it was necessary "to create and maintain credibility" without regarding "credibility" as a "synonym of the truth". The full truth was neither necessary, nor advisable;

certain facts must be modified "according to the public object". However psychological war and terror were by no means reduced to a more refined manipulation of "public objects" whose consciousness had already been prepared by decades of anti-Communism. Chile's social system and the very evolution of the process in the 1970-73 period led to a situation in which the policy of terror, like the entire previous policy of anti-communism, gradually turned among large sections of the bourgeoisie, including part of the petty bourgeoisie, into a sufficiently coherent and systemised *form of ideology*.

The caste that had ruled earlier could not for class reasons have a progressive ideology. On the other hand, it was no longer in a position to use outdated, crisis-ridden democracy of the liberal bourgeois type as a means of mobilising the masses. As a result, this ideological vacuum was filled by a "policy of the irrational", which became a factor in organising and mobilising the masses and led to the appearance of the abominable outlines of Chilean fascism. It is its irrationality that enables fascist ideology to shape stereotypes of social consciousness as it pleases. The fascist state begins to operate as an expression of the nation's "will"; class conflicts are replaced by conflicts between nations, which, in turn, are regarded as living beings with their psychology and temperament and with a definite predestination inherited from their ancestors; society is not organised on the basis of the decisive role of people's objective position in the system of social production but on the basis of such "vital organic structures" as trade union, corporations, family or state.

While racial concepts do not stand out in the ideology of Chilean fascism (due possibly to its dependent character), all the above points are present, nevertheless, in the theoretical and political utterances of Chile's reactionary ideologists. Chilean conditions gave rise to these concepts, and imperialism adapted them to its objectives through its experts in terror and psychological manipulation. Thus imperialism made a decisive contribution to the framing of the strategy and tactics of reactionary forces and to the theoretical seasoning of the social psychology of fascism.

The events in Chile revealed, in our view, that in periods of social upheaval, a subjective factor such as the "morale" of aroused masses—a factor to which reaction attached strategic importance—becomes one of the most important. In seeking "destabilisation", imperialism did not lean on the ideological and scientific notions of the social consciousness of the masses, but directly influenced their emotions. It may be said to have prevented the masses in this way from realising their interests, which would undoubtedly have prompted a substantial part of them to side with the popular government.

Experience has shown that the revolutionary working class must rely on ideological elements of social consciousness adequate to a scientific knowledge of social laws. Hence the social psychology of the masses acquires a rational basis. Revolutionary fervour, in turn, strengthens the ideological convictions of the radicalised masses. In this case, all that imperialism has to do is to influence irrational emotions and then the ideology based on them will inevitably become thoroughly irrational, destructive and unhistorical.

However, all this is a lesson to the popular movement, for we failed to give battle to the class enemy in the field of social psychology, nor did we use it to muster our own revolutionary forces. We are more aware now of the vast importance of taking account of the elements of the social psychology of the

masses [illegible] analysing concrete situations. The founders of Marxism-Leninism always pointed out these factors as a permanent component of a scientifically grounded policy. Their every analysis gives a precise definition of the mood of the masses as a decisive factor in the balance of forces at a given moment. "We could not have retained power either physically or politically (in the event of a rising—*R. R.*)." Lenin wrote. "We could not have retained it physically even though Petrograd was at times in our hands, because at that time our workers and soldiers would not have fought and died for Petrograd. There was not at the time that 'savageness', or fierce hatred *both of* the Kerenskys *and of* the Tseretelis and Chernovs. Our people had still not been tempered by the experience of the persecution of the Bolsheviks in which the Socialist-Revolutionaries and Mensheviks participated" (V. I. Lenin, *Coll. Works*, Vol. 26, p. 24).

What happened in our case was that we failed to make an adequate assessement of the energy of the masses, of the workers' sacred class hatred for imperialism and fascism.

The difficult school of anti-fascist struggle adds to the communist training of our Party, directly influences our people's social psychology and fosters their revolutionary awareness. However, we do not wish anyone to go through such a school. The Chilean people would prefer a different path but they are seething with hatred of people ready to give their lives for freedom.

Theoreticians of terror and psychological warfare do not overlook the fact that the people have lost neither their political common sense, nor their indomitable critical spirit, and that the fear that had gripped some is slowly but inexorably turning into irresistible class hatred. Hence the fascist regime's dread of the people, hence also its brutal round-ups of revolutionaries and its policy of genocide and prison camps.

The people are not vindictive. They will be able, in particular, to distinguish their true enemies from those who were misled or failed to stay the murderer's hand out of cowardice—their own conscience will be their sternest judge. But, to quote Luis Corvalan, "the DINA murderers and executioners, Pinochet and his clique, whose hands are stained with the people's blood, must be punished according to their deserts." Our strength lies in the organisation, intelligence and militancy of a people who will live up to their historical role and display proper resolve. They will use every form of struggle against their enemies to end the night of fascism and open up new vistas, such as President Allende spoke of.

---

[1] *El Siglo*, August 31, 1972, p. 6.

[2] Here and elsewhere, quotations from *Psychological Operations* are retranslated from the Spanish original of this article.—*Ed.*

[3] Daily newspaper owned by the Edwards clan, a major Chilean finance group that joined and financially contributed to the US monopoly campaign against the Popular Unity government.

[4] Left-wing Revolutionary Movement, an ultraleftist organisation that carried out numerous actions against the Popular Unity programme and tried to set up an "authority" parallel to the lawful government.

eyes, their deep knowledge of the working man's needs, their readiness to uphold through action the workers' rights to an existence fit for man, their well-considered proposals on pressing trade union issues are, I believe, the qualities that have earned them prestige at the enterprise. I would also like to confirm my attitude to the Party by voting for its candidates but there are none where I live.

Exchange of Views, Discussion

Economics and Politics Under Developed Socialism

Theoretical Conference

AS reported in our January issue, an international theoretical conference on Interaction of the Economic and Political Systems of the Socialist Countries at the Present Stage was held in Berlin, organised by *World Marxist Review* in co-operation with the Central Committee of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany.

The conference was attended by scholars from the following countries: Bulgaria, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, the GDR, Hungary, Mongolia, Poland, Rumania and the Soviet Union and by members of the *WMR* Editorial Board and Editorial Council.

The conference was opened by **Hannes Hörnig**, head of the Science Department of the SUPG Central Committee. He welcomed the participants on behalf of the Party's Central Committee and its General Secretary, Comrade Honecker.

We regard this meeting, Hörnig said, as one more step towards joint elaboration by the fraternal parties of the theoretical problems involved in the further development of socialist society and its gradual transition to communism.

The latest Party congresses in the socialist countries reaffirmed their main aim of bringing to reality the humane essence of socialism, raise the people's cultural and material standards through a high growth rate in the socialist economy, increase the effectiveness of production, accelerate scientific and technological progress and achieve a higher level of labour productivity. Economics represent a key area of social life and are in the centre of the struggle between socialism and imperialism.

The congresses also emphasised the substantially closer identity of our parties' long-term policies and of their main goals in various spheres of social life. This underscores, Hörnig said, the growing ideological and practical importance of joint theoretical work and comradely discussion, by scholars and Party functionaries in the fraternal countries, of the essential problems involved in socialist and communist construction.

Of special theoretical and practical interest are such problems as indivisible unity of economic and social policy and the ways and means of accelerating scientific and technological progress, improving the pattern of socio-economic relations, and extending socialist democracy. The strength of socialist

:mocracy resides in its progressively deeper penetration of all areas of social 'e. Its characteristic feature is continuous stimulation of the working masses' eativity, initiative and social activity. Extension of socialist democracy brings ı ever wider segment of the people into the planning and management of social :velopment. It strengthens socialism's political system and creates the material ıd ideological conditions for the all-round development of the socialist :rsonality. Accelerated economic development, inseparable from perfection of e political system, makes for closer community of the fraternal countries in ıcialist and communist construction and leads to the flourishing and ›nvergence of socialist nations. Active struggle against bourgeois and reformist eology, the speaker stressed, also calls for joint effort to further develop [arxism-Leninism on the basis of the Communist and Workers' parties' volutionary experience.

In his contribution, the Editor-in-Chief of *World Marxist Review*, **Konstantin ırodov**, Dr. Sc. (Hist.), noted that the problems of developed socialist society ıve in the past few years been the subject of discussion at a number of ternational theoretical conferences and symposia organised by the journal in ›njunction with the central committees of fraternal parties. In particular, we scussed such questions as socialism's place in history, the stages and criteria of s development, the characteristics and specifics of developed socialism, the orking class and its party in socialist society, the present-day problems of ıcialist democracy and the prospects of its development, the scientific and chnological revolution as a key factor in the competition of the two systems, ıd other problems.[1]

The subject of this conference, Zarodov continued, is of vast importance both r the theory and practice of socialist and communist construction. Marxists-:ninists have always shown a keen interest in the relation between economics ıd politics. That is so because one cannot understand political process without ıowing their economic basis; because the emancipation of labour, i.e., the .ndamental refashioning of economic relations, is the foundation and a :cessary condition for the emancipation of the individual; because after the iumph of the socialist revolution economics become "our most interesting ›licy", for they represent the ground-work of the new society; because the onomic competition of socialism and capitalism is a crucial sphere of the class ruggle on the international scene and a condition for achieving the political ms of the proletariat.

In building developed socialism, questions relating to the interaction of cialism's economic and political systems present themselves, in a certain sense, a new light. And to single out this new presentation, i.e., the premise of our ıalysis of a given problem in the mid-seventies, we have to consider it, as Lenin ught us, historically, in the context of other phenomena and the concrete perience of history. Theoretical analysis and practical solution of concrete oblems in the economic, political, ideological and other areas of socialist ciety directly depend on this.

DIALECTICAL INTERCONNECTION

Lenin's thoughts on the relation of economics and politics, his idea that ›olitics cannot but have primacy over economics", have been confirmed at 'ery stage of socialism: in the transition period and in coping with the problems

strengthening the foundations of socialism. In present-day conditions too, ›litics retain their primacy over economics. Why?

Socialist society, said Professor Z. Haba, of the CC CP Czechoslovakia ıstitute of Marxism-Leninism, is not the result of some spontaneous socio-onomic development, but of the purposeful revolutionary activity of the orking class and all working people led by the Communist Party and based on ›gnition and utilisation of the laws of social development.

Socialism is a society in which class distinctions have not yet been obliterated ıd still make themselves felt. It is a society in which national relations are an ıportant component of social life, in which there still exist differences between e aims, aspirations and actions of individuals between the interests of the dividual, the collective and society. That is why it is so important to work out ›mmon strategic aims, harmonise the interests of various classes and social oups within the framework of a scientifically-grounded concept of social :velopment. Solution of these problems requires political leadership. That is ıy Lenin's statement that "without a correct political approach to the matter e given class will be unable to stay on top, and, consequently, will be incapable solving its *production problems* either" (*Coll. Works,* Vol. 32, p. 84).

Another speaker, O. T. Bogomolov, corresponding member of the USSR :ademy of Sciences and Director of its Institute of the Economy of the World ›cialist System, said that the Marxist proposition on the primacy of oduction, production relations, and the totality of social relations, retains all validity in developed socialist society. But because developed socialism is bject to conscious, purposeful development, politics run ahead of economics, ough the state of the economy places definite limits and presents definite mands on politics.

In the opinion of Bogomolov, the conversion of the Soviet Union from the ıte of proletarian dictatorship into the state of all the people, should not be ıderstood as depolitisation of public life. Politics as a conscious activity :ected at subjecting one class to another gradually lose their importance with : maturing of socialist social relations. But, at the same time, the role of politics :reases as a means of assuring the interests of the state of all the people in ·ecting economic and cultural development, in international relations, and also a factor which takes into account and integrates the interests of all the social ›ups and assures the moral and political unity of the people.

The primacy of politics over economics, discussion speakers noted, requires lution of a number of methodological problems that arise in the course of ilding developed socialism and communism. One of the most essential of :se, Zarodov remarked, is how to delineate the spheres of political and ›nomic decision-making. Political decisions define the aims and direction of ›nomic development and in this we have a manifestation of their primacy over ›nomics. But concrete technico-economic decisions must, in our view, enjoy a ·tain degree of autonomy.

However, this raises a whole complex of questions relating to the correct ıctical application of the principles of democratic centralism, combining mpetence and responsibility, subordination and independence. There is also a ;h probablity of errors of a dual nature (and we know that such errors have :ured): voluntarism, overestimation of the role of political institutions, which ıregard economic reality, an automaticism, which disregards the importance of

effective political influence on the economy. How can we create a barrier to such errors? To what extent and by which means can we limit spontaneity and more powerfully influence spontaneous processes? How can we assure consistent implementation of the tried and tested principle that the Party directs and leads socialist society, while the state administrates?

One of the most effective instruments in this respect is systems approach to phenomena of social life. It rests on the Marxist-Leninist conception of socialist society as an integrated social organism. The fundamental principle of systems approach is overall managment of systems as the basis for concrete solutions of management problems in the various elements of the socialist economy, the state, society, but it cannot, of course, replace not only the general philosophical, but also the political approach.

Our ideological opponents, Zarodov continued, are at pains to produce a distorted picture of the role of the Marxist-Leninist parties in socialist society. As the leading force of that society, the Communist and Workers' parties in the socialist countries do not act merely as passive recorders of objective phenomena. They actively interfere in these phenomena. But their political activity is based not on absolute will or on authoritarian power, but on a deep knowledge of the objective laws of social development, on ability to apply these laws in their interaction.

Referring to the socialist economic management mechanism, Prof. N. **Popov**, head of the Economics Department of Sofia University, emphasised that planning enables the socialist state to achieve fuller accordance between its policy and the objective requirements of economic laws. True, the economic management mechanism does not always meet objective requirements and in this sense we should not rule out the possibility of spontaneity in economic processes. However, socialism is in a position to overcome such spontaneity, in particular by assuring a closer interconnection between the plan and other economic levers and the principles of democratic centralism.

The experience of all socialist countries, Popov continued, has shown that without centralised planning the immense potentialities of the socialist mode of production cannot be fully used to accelerate economic development. From this point of view, centralised planning is one of the most essential, determinative elements of scientific management of the socialist national economy. However, fuller satisfaction of national interests is impossible if the economy is not allowed a wider scope for decentralised planning. Consequently, in conformity with the requirements of democratic centralism, planning, as an instrument of the economic mechanism, must on the one hand be centralised (the national economic plan) and on the other decentralised (the plan of each economic unit).

In Popov's opinion, finding the most optimal balance between the centralised and the decentralised, which would minimise subjectivism in planning and the proper use of economic laws, is today—and possibly in the future—the most complex question of socialist economic management. It is true, of course, that centralism as a principle of socialist economic management is at the same time an expression of democracy, for every government decision on economic development is in the interests of the people. However, the development of socialist democracy is inconceivable without the active and day-to-day participation of the working people in management, and this is facilitated by our system of economic direction, which encourages and stimulates local initiative.

The vast scope of economic, political and social transformations in our country at the present historical stage of building a comprehensively developed socialist society, **Ilie Radulescu**, member of the Rumanian Academy of Social and Political Sciences, said, calls for more stress on the political factor in organising and directing social activity and on the scientific principles of our leadership of society. More than ever before it is necessary to limit the sphere of action of spontaneous forces and create a socio-political climate and institutional framework for the successful use of the creativity on the masses. The Party's growing leading role does not imply wider use of administrative methods, but primarily its assertion as a political factor, the initiator of social-development policies and programmes, and the organiser of the people's creative forces.

In all its activities, the Rumanian Communist Party is guided by the common regularities of socialist construction, which it applies creatively in keeping with Rumanian reality. Ignoring these regularities would be tantamount to subjectivism and voluntarism, both of which have a negative effect on the development of society. By the same token, disregard of the organisational and leading role of the political factor, the assumption that socialism itself determines the course of social development without intervention by the political factor, can only produce spontaneity and lead to the loss of the historical perspective.

Referring to the leading role of the Rumanian Communist Party, the speaker said that the Party does not stand above society, does not stand outside the activity of the working people but acts together with the people and together with them works out and implements its policy. Such close intertwining of Party, state and social activity, by delegating state functions to Party officials, and also by establishing leading bodies of a dual character, that is, both Party and state, is an important aspect of bringing the Party into the social life of the nation.

Other speakers emphasised that if politics are to effectively assist economic development they must be based on the scientific principles. A wrong or inadequately accurate estimation of economic and political conditions and the advancement of unrealistic aims can only complicate or hold back the progressive development of society.

That was emphasised by several speakers, and one of them, **Aladar Sipos**, head of the Economics Department at the Hungarian Higher Political School and a member of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences, cited an example of such discordance between economic reality and policy. There have unfortunately been cases in Hungary, he said, of premature, formal concentration of production without due regard to the level of technical development or the conditions in the amalgamated enterprises. This has led to a situation in which today we do not have an optimal number of small enterprises though there is need for them in our industrial structure. One of the most serious problems in Hungarian industry is inadequate development of co-operation between enterprises, and also between industries. Overcoming this situation is an important task of our economic policy.

The need to strengthen the scientific foundations of political direction of the economy was stressed also by Professor **Kvotoslav Roubal**, Deputy Director of the Czechoslovak Institute of Marxism-Leninism. In operating our policy, he said, it is especially important to see the new features in the interaction of basis and superstructure resulting from the scientific and technological revolution. The theoretical generalisation of this is of first-rate importance for the

continuous development of socialism. And we in Czechoslovakia are carefully studying these new features in order to frame and implement a more effective policy in building developed socialist society. In this context, one of the most important conclusions we have drawn is the need to enhance the role of the Party and of economic and organisational work by the state, that is, of the entire superstructure vis-a-vis the material and technical basis and economic structure of socialist society.

In socialist society there is deep interaction, even interpenetration, of economics and politics. But can we visualise a situation in which economics run ahead of politics?

The question was put by **Alberto Kohen** (Argentina), member of the *WMR* Editorial Board. And in answering it, Sipos remarked that objective contradictions between the two were not to be precluded. Of course, they are not antagonistic contradictions, but just the same they have to be studied and resolved in order to promote socialist development. If we do not detect them in good time, this can lead to social conflicts. We had proof of that in Hungary, and I think, not only in Hungary. However, the domination of socialist public property and socialist production relations make it possible to use objective economic laws in the interests of the working people, in the interests of the whole of society, and thus prevent social conflicts.

A similar view was expressed by Zarodov. Discordance between economics and politics might arise in the concrete conditions of one or another socialist country. In certain circumstances this could lead (and has led) to tense and even conflict situations. Our parties, the speaker emphasised, have never shut their eyes to these contradictions and have taken timely steps to resolve them, for the political system of socialism is sufficiently mature for that. Contradictions between politics and economics under capitalism is quite another matter, for there we have the antagonism between labour and capital. And in capitalist conditions these contradictions are insoluble. It is therefore wrong to transplant elements of economics and politics characteristic of capitalism to socialist society.

Close interconnection between the economic and political systems does not, however, mean that they are being disolved in each other. Experience has shown, for example, that at the stage of developed socialism, the economic and organisational functions of the state increase substantially. Moreover, its activity is directed to an ever greater degree at making fuller use of the objective laws that determine the development of the economic basis. the state makes wide use of objective economic categories (prices, profit, wages, cost accounting, etc.) to improve production relations, thereby stimulating the growth of the productive forces. However, close interconnection of economics and politics in socialist society does not mean that the socialist state ceases to be a political superstructure and is "immersed" or "diluted" in economics.

D. A. Kerimov, Head of the Constitutional Law Department of the CC CPSU Academy of Social Sciences and corresponding member of the USSR Academy of Sciences, emphasised the need to take the following important considerations into account. First, the Marxist-Leninist teaching on the basis and superstructure does not preclude their interaction. Though it emphasises that the superstructure is produced and determined by the basis, it does not merge with it, nor is it diluted in it. Second, the activity of superstructure institutions, the

activity of the socialist state, including its economic and organisational activity represents a conscious and purposeful implementation of the economic policy of the Marxist-Leninist party, a policy which, in turn, does not coincide with objective economic processes, but is a more or less accurate reflection of them. Third and last, if we are to regard the state as part of the basis, then we shall have to transfer to the basis many other superstructure phenomena that are even more closely linked with the economic life of society. For instance our laws, which directly regulate production relations.

Politics, the speaker continued, are not a mechanical reflection of economics, but their transformation in people's minds. They are the subjective image of the objective. And precisely because politics reproduce economics in a generalised and concentrated form, they can influence economic processes in one way or another.

John Nkosi (South African Communist Party) asked: "Does this mean that you regard politics mainly as a subjective and not an objective phenomenon and that the state is, in the main, an ideological factor of development?"

Kerimov: When I spoke of politics as a reflection of economics, I presented the question gnosiologically. Perhaps that is why the impression was created that I regard the state only as an ideological factor. But it should be perfectly clear that the state is also a material force.

Question by **Adel Haba**, representative of the Iraqi Communist Party on the Editorial Board: "Can we today, too, consider the socialist state as organised violence, coercion?"

Kerimov: I think we must distinguish between the concepts of violence and coercion. At every stage of its development the socialist state has recourse to coercion in cases when its laws are violated. As for violence, I think it is a class concept and as a function of the socialist state it disappears when it is no longer necessary to use violence against the exploiting classes.

Many speakers suggested that the more active role of politics vis-a-vis economics raised specific problems which indicate that the old economic methods and the purely managerial administrative approach are no longer adequate or even totally ineffectual. This is due, above all, to the deeper and more complex interconnection between the development of the material and technical basis, on the one hand, and the political tasks and aims of social development, the ideological and moral factors, on the other. That is why the 25th CPSU Congress and the congresses of other fraternal parties in the socialist countries lay so much stress on improving the interaction of the economic and political systems, especially the managment of society and of production.

Referring to the basic directions in improving the interaction of economics and politics, Zarodov noted that in the USSR there have been several measures in recent years to perfect economic and social management. They include industry-wide and republican institutes for advanced training of leading cadres, and dissemination of economic and sociological knowledge. Another important means of improving the interaction of economics and politics is through better planning, and planning now extends not only to the economy but also to the social sphere. Centralised decisions are more closely combined with local independence.

Politics, the speaker noted, rely on science, but at the same time they are an art. Naturally, we would like to see political and social management becoming more

and more a science within the reach of the broad masses. And this is becoming a reality as we extend our knowledge of the laws governing social life and enrich the political and managerial experience not only of our leading cadres, but also of the rank-and-file workers of town and country, and as the very system of management becomes more rational and efficient.

Another characteristic feature of developed socialism is the new methods of economic regulation of production. Administrative management by state bodies is more and more being based on economically substantiated decisions. Among other things, this leaves less room for bureaucratic distortions which, as experience has shown, are one of the most tenacious survivals of the past. Favourable conditions are thus being created for broader initiative at factory level and for more worker participation in management at all levels. Economic democracy is inseparable from democracy in all other areas of political and social life. Under capitalism, where the workers are denied a share in economic decision-making, there is only restrictive political democracy.

Gyorgy Borsanyi, of the Hungarian Institute of Party History, pointed out that public ownership of the means of production greatly expands the political framework and gives it an entirely new content. This "politicalisation" has awakened in the masses an understanding of, and faith in, the vast political significance of their participation in management. Every citizen now has the opportunity to play a substantial part in decision-making at all levels.

Speaking on the same subject, Professor **Helmut Koziolek**, Director of the SUPG Central Institute of Socialist Economics, said that to further encourage mass initiative we should apply various forms of democratic participation and bring much wider strata of the working people into the work of management and planning. This, of course, requires careful study of all the different forms of initiative, broader exchange of experience, effective use of the knowledge and energy of the working people. We must give much more thought to the conditions which economic executives must provide for allround development of initiative. These include fostering an appropriate socio-psychological climate in the factories, giving the workers more information, and better organisation of work.

Professor **Henryk Cholaj**, corresponding member of the Polish Academy of Sciences, asked: Could you describe the basic forms of worker participation in the management of industry in the GDR?

The most important of these forms, Professor Koziolek said, is regular worker conferences at all factories, combines, in all districts and regions, to discuss intensification of production. They examine the main development problems of the given factory or industry and map out goals for the coming year and for the five-year period. The Technical Chambers, organised in the factories and composed of blue-collar and white-collar workers, are making an increasing contribution, too. I would also mention the much more important role of factory Party branches, and, since the Eighth SUPG Congress (1971) of factory trade union branches, in particular shop stewards' meetings. And so, we have established at factory level an effective system of democracy: the Party, the trade unions, the Technical Chambers, all of which work in close co-operation on questions of management. At the same time, the speaker continued, I would emphasise that this collective participation in management does not replace the

principle of one-man management for only an optimal combination of these two principles can produce the desired results.

Replying to a question put by **Dashdondov**, Deputy Director of the Mongolian Institute of Economics, **Vladimir Shundeyev**, Executive Editor of *World Marxist Review*, emphasised that contrasting centralised direction by the state to the self-activity of the working people and of local government bodies can lead—and there have been instances of this kind in the history of socialist construction—to the most undesirable consequences. For instance, to the growth of parochial tendencies, imbalances in the economic structure and so on. The growing economic role of the state is dictated by a number of objective factors. It should be clear, for instance, that balanced development of the economy and rational distribution of the productive forces cannot be solved at local level. These questions require a centralised approach by the state. And that is all the more necessary in the socialist state's pursuance of its, so to say, international economic functions, that is, in deciding on participation in the international division of labour, in integration processes. We should also bear in mind that with the existence of classes the principle applied is renumeration according to work performed, and this means that there is a certain degree of inequality in the satisfaction of consumption requirements. That being the situation, defining the measure of labour and the measure of consumption can be done only by the state. For it alone can uphold the interests of the entire nation, pursue an economic and social policy that accords with the interests of society as a whole. By the same token, counterposing the state to production collectives is, I think, unjustifiable also because it does not take into account the class character of the socialist state, which expresses the interests of the popular masses, including the production collectives. Lastly, when we say that strategic decisions are made at the central, state level, this should not be taken to mean that the working people have no share in formulating such decisions. Quite the contrary, we have been working to perfect the mechanism of such participation and enhance the role of production collectives, public organisations, and so on. And so both principles of management, democracy and centralism, can prove fruitful only if they are applied in their dialectical unity.

Our Party, Radulescu said, is implementing socialist democracy in its three main aspects: economic democracy to assure all the conditions for direct worker participation in industrial management from factory to national level; political democracy to create the social climate and institutional structures the people need to exercise political power and democratic freedoms; social democracy to assure their direct participation in managing social affairs. The principles of collective leadership and collective work are inseparable from the concept of socialist democracy.

Perfection of socialist democracy was the subject of the contribution by Professor **Wolfgang Weichelt**, Director of the Constitutional Law Institute of the GDR Academy of Sciences. The Ninth SUPG Congress, he said, emphasised that the Party's policy aims at the further all-round strengthening of the workers' and peasants' state as a form of the dictatorship of the proletariat. The main direction in the development of the socialist state is through strengthening and perfecting socialist democracy. Obviously, there is a close interconnection between strengthening the socialist state and perfecting socialist democracy, for both represent component elements of a broad social process, namely, the

growing activity of the entire political organisation of socialist society. This understanding of the question coincides with the conclusions drawn by the 24th and 25th CPSU congresses and by the congresses of other fraternal parties.

Like any other form of democracy, Weichelt further emphasised, socialist democracy has its class substance. It should be seen as a creative collective effort that makes for a full, spiritually rich life in which there is no place for exploitation and oppression. But that is possible only if no loopholes are left for the anti-socialist forces. The basis of such democracy is socialist ownership of the means of production and political power in the hands of the working class.

A unitary economic and social policy, the speaker continued, presupposes closer interconnection between various forms of organisation of the political superstructure of socialist society, and precisely this interconnection requires our special attention and a new approach. This does not imply that we have discovered some new political organisation of socialist society, but that there is clearer and closer interaction in the development of the state and the deepening of socialist democracy. There is a closer interconnection of all the processes of political, economic, scientific and technical, social and cultural development of socialist society, and growing activity of the working people both through state forms of management and through their public organisations. This means that the organisation and consciousness towards which developed socialism is striving, find their manifestation, above all, in the coordinated actions of all the component parts of the political superstructure. And, incidentally, this is an expression of the social content of socialist democracy, its historically superior quality compared with its opposite, formal bourgeois democracy.

Experience has shown that the growing activity of the mass public organisations makes for better functioning of the state, and, conversely, more efficient work by the various state agencies, a clear and precise formulation of tasks, consistent observance of our laws, of the rights and obligations of state agencies and citizens, activise the work of the mass public organisations. In this we have an expression of the internal interconnection between the two, of the dialectics of the political organisation of socialist society. Its core is the Marxist-Leninist working-class party. Its objectively growing leading role is evidence of genuine democracy, an element that imparts a socialist quality to the new, higher type of democracy.

The growing role of the ruling Marxist-Leninist parties in directing socialist society, the content and principles of their activity, were discussed in some detail by other speakers including A. Haba, K. Roubal, O. T. Bogomolov, and I. Radulescu.

New Strategy of Socio-Economic Development

What are the aims of economic progress under socialism? What tendencies in the social life of society accompany the growth of the economy and living standards? What is the strategy of the Communist parties in boosting the social and economic development of the fraternal countries?—these were among the questions that evoked a lively debate at the conference.

In discussing them, speakers took as their premise the fact that the economy, the material and technical basis of society and the very foundation of its development, will continue to be the focus of attention of the ruling Marxist-Leninist parties of the socialist states. The basis for resolving the momentous

social problems, said **Barbu Zaharescu**, member of the journal's Editorial Board and corresponding member of the Rumanian Academy of Sciences, is primarily material production. Without it we cannot achieve our supreme humanistic aim of socialism, namely, fuller satisfaction of the material and spiritual requirements of the whole of society and of each of its members. In the socialist countries economic development, the growth of material production, has never been an end in itself, nor a means of extracting profit from one or another group. And in this we have the fundamental difference between socialism and capitalism.

In a socialist country, Zaharescu stressed, economic progress is always closely linked with social progress. This is not a matter of cause and effect, but rather of close interaction between the economic factor and the totality of social relations.

Many speakers devoted their contributions to an analysis of how the Communist parties are working to develop their countries' national economies. Thus, Dashdondov spoke in detail of how the Mongolian People's Republic is solving such important problems as raising the degree of maturity of socialist production relations, bringing Mongolia's economic development level up to that of other CMEA countries. In the realm of economic policy, he pointed out, our main task is to complete the building of an optimal material and technical basis of socialism. This is being accomplished through further industrialisation, mechanisation of agriculture, and a higher level of technical equipment in all branches of the economy. In 1961-75, Mongolia made long forward steps in assuring stable growth rates and a steady rise in prosperity standards. The productive forces have been extended and production relations perfected. The economic strategy mapped out by the 17th Party Congress (June 1976) is based on a thorough scientific examination of our main economic problems and defines the basic direction of development, thus revealing to the masses the social implications of our new tasks in economic upbuilding.

Professor **Jon Totu**, Director of the Central Economic Research Institute of the Supreme Council of Social and Economic Development of the Socialist Republic of Rumania, discussed various aspects of the process of industrialisation in Rumania. Our Communist Party Programme, he emphasised, sets out the aims, ways and basic processes of building comprehensively developed socialism. It envisages substantial quantitative and qualitative transformations in the country's industrial structure.

Many speakers pointed to a characteristic feature of the present stage in building socialism: the close unity and interaction of economic and social progress and of the economic and social policies of the Communist parties. This unity, Professor **Karl-Heinz Stiemerling**, Deputy Director of the CC SUPG Institute of Social Sciences, said, is an expression of the humane character of the socialist system. It stems from the aims of socialist production, from the fact that effective management of the economy is the basis of social progress. The results obtained in the period between the Eighth (1971) and Ninth (1976) SUPG congresses confirm the correctness of our policy, based on the interconnection of economic and social advancement. This is now understood by every citizen of the republic. For it was in this period that the Party concentrated on social problems which the vast majority of the workers and the people generally regarded as urgent. And this applies to practically every aspect of life in our republic. The SUPG socio-political programme envisages such measures as extensive housing

construction, systematic wage and pension rises, better health services, mor assistance to working mothers and large families, steady reduction of work time, improvement of recreation and cultural amenities.

The interconnection of economic and social policy, Cholaj emphasised reflects the objective conditions of the period of building and protecting developed socialist society. A correct socio-economic development strategy is of crucial importance for optimal results in our economic effort. The integration of the social and economic aspects of the development process, priority attention to social matters as a factor of economic development—all this makes for more rapid economic growth and brings to bear new factors. Hence, such integration enriches the very concept of the development process. This finds its most concentrated expression in the formula of the main aim of socialism, namely increasing the prosperity standards of the people and all-round development of the personality.

In building a developed socialist society, Koziolek said, we are bringing to life the very meaning of socialism—everything for the good of the people, everything in the interests of the working class, the co-operative peasantry, the intelligentsia and other working people. Accordingly, the supreme aim of our Party's policy is accomplishment of the main task in building developed socialist society as formulated in the SUPG Programme. And this tasks is to continue raising the material and cultural level of the people through a high rate of development of socialist production, through higher effectiveness, scientific and technical progress and the growth of labour productivity.

Some speakers criticised the view that only at this stage has Party policy turned its "face to the people", and that in earlier years it concentrated allegedly on industrialisation, defence, etc. The young revolutionary state, Haba remarked in this connection, concentrated all its efforts on satisfying the vital requirements of the people. And our working people immediately felt the beneficial results of social change. However the implementation of this policy was complicated in those years by a number of negative circumstances. Among them the low starting economic level in several socialist countries, the immaturity of socialist production relations, the need to change the structure of industry, the discriminatory measures taken by the capitalist countries in foreign trade, etc.

At its present development stage, the speaker continued, socialism is much nearer to solving the problem of full satisfaction of the essential requirements of the people. This applies not only to areas in which socialism long ago demonstrated its immeasurable superiority over capitalism (public health, education, social maintenance), but also to living standards.

Due to a number of factors, Borsanyi said, social and economic policy in Hungary were not harmonised in the early stages of building the new life. Beside the above-mentioned objective historical conditions there was this additional impediment: some sections of society understood industrialisation to mean the building of the foundations of socialism.

This mechanical copy of Soviet experience, Borsanyi continued, led to excessive accent on heavy industry to the detriment of all other spheres of socialist construction. We lost sight of the fact that industrialisation is not the ultimate aim, but a means—though a very necessary one in Hungary—of building the basis of socialism and its further development. The Party made the necessary corrections in economic policy in the mid-fifties and this, alongside

collectivisation of agriculture, assured the dominance of socialist production relations.

The growth of material well-being, speakers pointed out, remains an exceedingly important task of economic and social policy. What are the criteria of this growth and how does it relate to the main aims of socio-economic development of socialist society, to the ideals of communism?

The socialist state, Roubal remarked, has no intention of introducing the consumerism of capitalist society, in which the level of consumption determines one's social status and is considered the highest aim of life. We know that in capitalist society some sections of the population, and even whole countries, indulge in wasteful consumption, while other sections of the population and many countries of the non-socialist world suffer from hunger and poverty. Socialism is guided by its own ideals, by a policy that assures harmonious distribution of material values and the all-round progress of society and its members.

This poses a new problem before socialist society, the speaker said. We must now choose one of many variants of continued development. Having satisfied the basic requirements of the population, socialist society must decide which requirements, material or spiritual, must get priority at the present stage. That the decision is being made is evidenced by the fact, for instance, that formulation of the basic economic law of socialism is no longer limited to the traditional proposition about maximum satisfaction of the material and cultural needs of the population as the aim of socialist society, but has been complemented by the need to promote the all-round development of the individual.

That view was supported by other speakers. Polish social scientists, Cholaj said, have in recent years been working on the problem of how to raise the role of man as the most important factor of progress. Objective requirements have given rise to a new orientation based on the premise that social progress is the synthesis of economic and social development. Accordingly, all our policy serves the interests of man, satisfaction of his various requirements and needs, with the accent now on the qualitative development of the personality. And this applies not only to Poland. It is expressive of the substantial changes in the social and economic picture in all the socialist community countries and accords with the regularities of the present stage of development.

Man, Cholaj emphasised, is the main productive force of society and economic progress depends upon him to a decisive degree. At the same time, the development of man is and should be a value in itself. That is why the new strategic policy does not boil down to increasing plan assignments in various branches of the economy, but aims at fuller achievement of the supreme goals of social policy, which in Poland has found embodiment in the formula "development achieved by the people and for the people". This implies, first, a new approach to the problem of consumption in the mechanism of socio-economic development, and, second, shifting the accent from raising prosperity standards to qualitative, all-round development of the man of socialist society. Today we must not only satisfy more of the people's material requirements, but also create conditions that stimulate the socialist way of life, the harmonious development of the human personality.

The mechanism of shaping a socialist-type personality was discussed in some detail by Haba. He said, in particular, that economic relations and the material

requirements connected with them are much more effective stimulators in this respect. Thus for instance, the new, socialist attitude to work should be based on one's inherent need to work, on the need to develop, in the process of work, one's spiritual and physical abilities and use them for the good of society. But this inherent need cannot arise simply as a result of education. It is connected with a change in the very character of labour, its transformation from something exhaustive, monotonous and unattractive, from something that is done out of economic necessity, into creative activity capable of bringing satisfaction. And if a person's work does not bring him satisfaction, it is hardly likely that the situation can change only with the help of educational measures.

But, Haba remarked, if the economic and material factors are to stimulate this new attitude to work, they must be consciously understood and accepted. Every concrete decision made by the individual largely depends on the level of his consciousness, the sum-total of the knowledge needed to take that decision, his ability to use that knowledge at the given moment. From this follows that the development of man is influenced not only by economic stimulators. More, in some cases they do not come into the picture at all. For instance, when a man prefers satisfaction of some other, say, spiritual needs. And such cases demonstrate the importance of ideological and cultural activity in shaping a comprehensively developed personality.

Professor **Günter Hoppe**, Head of the Scientific Communism Institute of the CC SUPG Academy of Social Sciences, and Docent **Zbigniew Sufin**, Head of the CC PUWP Institute of Basic Problems of Marxism-Leninism, discussed various aspects of the work of Marxist-Leninist parties in perfecting the socialist way of life. The socialist way of life, Professor Hoppe emphasised, implies a concrete process of forming collective and individual behaviour patterns at work, in political organisations, at home, in the family, etc. And this process is closely linked with modern productive forces, with socialist production relations and social consciousness.

The development and strengthening of the socialist way of life, Hoppe remarked, is inseparable from the steady heightening of labour productivity and industrial effectiveness. The working class, and the working people generally, know that they are working for themselves, for their socialist society, that they are creating the decisive material conditions for the steady development of the socialist way of life. The day-to-day effort of work collectives in fulfilling plan assignments promotes and develops relations of comradely co-operation and mutual assistance, which are features of the socialist mode of production. It instills such high moral qualities as a socialist attitude to one's work and to socialist property, mutual assistance, an understanding of one's responsibility to society. Within the work collective there is formed respect for the personality, for the achievements of fellow workers and other collectives and a keen interest in one's job. That is why the work collectives are of such vast importance in cultivating the socialist way of life.

Another major factor is more worker participation in the management of state and public affairs and a higher level of consciousness, activity and responsibility.

An essential element of the socialist way of life, Sufin said, is a correct pattern of consumption. In Poland, quantitative improvement of the consumption of basic items is a stage we passed already in the 50s. Since then there has been also a qualitative change, with the demand for less valuable and cheaper goods being

replaced by a demand for more valuable and higher-priced. At present many families can choose from a very wide variety of goods. The task, therefore, is to shape consumer behaviour, create a social model of consumption.

That aspect was emphasised also by Borsanyi. Today all of us agree that the puritan asceticism of the early period of socialism was not our ideal, but was forced upon us by objective historical factors. It has lived out its day. However, there is evidence that the ideals of the so-called consumer society are beginning to penetrate our countries. This finds expression in the drive for material benefits, for status symbols. So far this affects only a small part of socialist society. But the growth of material well-being raises the problem of working out a model, an optimal model of consumption that accords with the principles of socialism. And unless we find an answer to that question through socio-economic planning, unless we direct this drive into correct channels, there is the danger that we would be involved in a spontaneous process.

All these problems, it was emphasised at the conference, are not solved automatically, but as a result of the Party's scientifically based activity in carrying out its social policy. In this context, there was considerable interest in Cholaj's views of the aims of social policy in socialist society. Sometimes social policy is seen as pertaining only to such things as social maintenance, etc. But as distinct from this narrow interpretation in the capitalist countries, under socialism social policy extends to all spheres of the life of society, including all aspects of the condition of the people. In developed socialist society, social policy includes also higher prosperity standards, formation of the socialist way of life, and refashioning of the social structure. A key aim of social policy, Cholaj said, is conscious restructuring of socialist society to achieve fuller social homogeneity.

It was from these positions that **Badamyn Lkhamsuren**, Dr.Sc.(Hist.), member of the *WMR* Editorial Board, described in detail the social policy of the Mongolian People's Revolutionary Party at the stage of completing the building of the material and technical basis of socialism. Our policy, he said, finds expression above all in perfecting the social structure of society, in fostering closer relations and unity of the various socio-class forces. And in this respect, a very significant development is the quantitative and qualitative growth of the working class, the leading force of Mongolian society. It is the policy of our Party to increase the size of the working class by drawing in young workers who received a good general and occupational training. There have been important changes also in the composition of our rural population, notably the larger number of trained farm-machinery operators.

The transformation of social relations, Zaharescu said, is influenced by he scientific and technological revolution. Rumania's current five-year plan has come to be known as the "technical-revolution plan". Wider use of precision techniques, electronics and automation contributes to the emergence of a new working class, distinguished for its high skill, culture and knowledge. Mechanisation and automation also help to form new production relations, based on the evening out of the education levels of machine operators and those who manage the production process as a whole.

Agricultural work, Zaharescu continued, is gradually assuming an industrial character. And this is not only an economic, but also a social process. For peasants who use scientific farming methods are becoming a class which, in basic indicators, differs less and less from the working class. Modern technology is

[illegible] very image of our villages. In the rural areas children attend ten-year schools, and by the end of the present five-year period 12-year schooling will be made obligatory. Besides, the villages now have medical and cultural facilities which before existed only in the towns. The process of obliterating the sharp distinctions between agricultural and industrial labour, between the basic classes of socialist society, has of course, not yet been completed. But we are moving towards that goal and nothing can prevent us from reaching it. In this we have an indication of how the Rumanian Communist Party applies the general laws of scientific socialism to the concrete conditions of our country, which is building a comprehensively developed socialist society.

In Hungary, Sipos said, agriculture is now in a period of production concentration and specialisation. The co-operative farms are bing converted into large modern enterprises working in contact with industry. The high level of industrial and agricultural integration can be seen in the organisation of agro-industrial amalgamations, a further step towards a better pattern of socialist property relations. These agro-industrial amalgamations. Sipos said, help to equalise conditions of life, social and political understanding, and the mentality of the co-operative peasantry and the working class.

The conference discussed also other aspects of socio-economic policy: harmonising the interests of the individual, the classes, basic social groups, and the interests of the whole of society (Roubal), perfecting the forms of socialist distribution (Zarodov, Stiemerling), the changing content and character of work. Referring to this last question, Koziolik remarked that the intensification of socialist production involves using the results of the technological revolution to change the very content of work, reduce the share of heavy manual labour and also of monotonous and health-hazard work.

In narrowing down the class and social differences in society, Stiemerling said, it is important consistently to implement the socialist principle of payment according to work performed. The central principle of economic and social life under socialism, it is based on the identity of the fundamental interests of the people and social requirements, bringing the two closer together and thus adding to the strength of socialism. It helps to increase production, make it more effective, heighten the quality of goods and give the workers a share in the distribution of material benefits in accordance with the quantity and quality of their work.

Another speaker, Kerimov, devoted much of his contribution to the problem of social planning. Begun in the mid-60s on the initiative of Leningrad enterprises, social planning has won wide recognition and application in the Soviet Union. At present more than 50,000 industrial collectives, building sites, transport organisations and other enterprises, collective farms and state farms have social development plans. Social planning, now being extended to whole regions is at this stage characterised by the following basic features. First, a sharp turn of the economy towards solving problems involved in raising prosperity and cultural standards of the people; the increasing feed-back effect of the social factor set production enterprises definite social goals. At the present stage planning social changes is becoming an objective necessity for the development of socialist society. Second, developed socialist society represents a qualitatively new level of social integration, and this calls for comprehensive planning not only of technical and economic development but also of social processes to assure harmonious growth of all the elements of the social organism. The latest

achievements of the social sciences provide more [illegible] for managi[ng] social processes.

Question by Stoyanov, Consultant of the *International Department* of th[e] Bulgarian Communist Party Central Committee: *What is the relation* in th[e] *Soviet Union between social and economic planning?*

***Kerimov:** I will begin by saying that with the development and improvement of social planning it becomes objectively necessary to introduce it in all the branches* of the national economy. For it is precisely at that level that such important social and economic problems are resolved as changing the character of work, designing new lines of production, raising skill standards, etc. And it is also becoming increasingly necessary to introduce social planning in large industrial combines, territorial divisions, and so on.

As for the connection between social and economic planning, it should be perfectly clear that the basis remains the basis, and there can be no social planning that is not connected with economic planning. And if I lay such emphasis on social planning, it is because economic planning has been more fully mastered in our country. Our ideal is integrated social economic planning at all levels, not only at national level.

International Aspects of the Problem

The discussion led to the conclusion that the categories of economics and politics in socialist society also have a number of international aspects. Research on these lines, K. I. Zarodov said, is important because it helps to ascertain the meaning of the creative, transforming role of the Communist parties of socialist countries in their foreign policy.

With the rise of the world socialist system, the speaker pointed out, the diversity of the roads to socialism and their distinctive national aspects ceased to be merely a theoretical assumption and became a reality. This diversity and these distinctions have now been confirmed by countries differing in tradition, economic level and political system, including those that were among the industrial countries of Europe and had mature bourgeois democratic systems. Furthermore, it is precisely now that the concept of socialism has become a genuine theoretical generalisation, for, to quote Marx, "the most general abstractions normally emerge only in the conditions of the richest concrete development, in which one and the same thing is common to many or to all. That is when it ceases to be thinkable in only a specific form".

From the methodological point of view, Zarodov said, the concept of society as an entity complete in itself shows a new dimension within the world socialist system. It now encompasses the socialist community, which, even in the presence of national frontiers, is an inherently integral commonwealth of socialist countries based on a common economic organisation, political system and ideology. By speaking of production relations in the socialist community, we recognise the existence of a common economic system—common in a certain sense (which, needless to say, does not imply that national autonomous, independent economic bodies enjoying equal rights have disappeared). Now the rise and development of a common economic system lead necessarily to the rise and perfection of an appropriate political system. Of course, I am speaking of a trend confirmed, in particular, by the formation and activity of the CMEA, the Warsaw Treaty Organisation and, within its framework, the Political

[illegible] Committees and other consultative, advisory and control bodies and organisations of the socialist community.

Communist parties regard the formation of such superstructural components as an objective requirement of the development of relations within the socialist community. The member countries of the community take a stand against making an absolute of national distinctions, on the one hand, and against rushing events as far as the development of international political and economic forms is concerned, on the other.

These views were backed by O. T. Bogomolov. The internationalisation process in the production sphere, he noted, promotes and enriches political and all other social relations between socialist countries. Advancing political co-operation, which helps to harmonise the socialist countries' vital interests and objectives, provides a solid basis for extending and intensifying mutual economic relations. Execution of the common economic, scientific and technological tasks set by the Comprehensive Programme for Socialist Economic Integration acquires political significance from the outset. This is understandable, for the more effectively integration tasks are accomplished, the more this stimulates the objective process of convergence of these countries in both the economic and the social sphere.

The mechanism of socialist economic integration and its interaction with the economic management mechanisms of the various countries of the socialist community was dealt with by G. Stoyanov. These countries, he said, are faced with essentially similar economic tasks, which leads to the formation of identical or kindred features in national managing mechanisms as well. The operation of the objective laws of socialism at national and international level results in the link-up and interlocking of national mechanisms and mechanisms common to the CMEA countries. In many respects, the latter begin to function as a common system through which integration processes and the participation of various countries in them are programmed and effected. In this system, national mechanisms operate as part of a common system or as subsystems. True, it would be premature to affirm that this system has fully taken shape. However, there is no doubt that an international managing system is in the making that has a number of features which both individual national management mechanisms and their sum-total lack.

Jon Totu pointed out the decisive role of internal factors, of the efforts of each particular people towards industrialisation and economic progress. Great importance attaches in this respect to an optimal ratio between the accumulation and consumption funds and as effective a utilisation of natural resources as possible. However, he stressed that the achievements of each socialist country are of special importance for vindicating the superiority of socialism on an international scale and for the growth of its world influence. In this connection, Totu touched on the role of the socialist countries' accelerated economic development. He pointed out that industrialisation on a large scale and the formation of up-to-date economic structures in each socialist country make it possible to extend scientific and technological co-operation and production coordination between socialist countries and constantly to harmonise national and internationalist interests. Achievement of the strategic objectives of industrialisation in every socialist country and world-wide vindication of the effectiveness of the new type of economic relations existing between socialist

countries must lead to growth of the economic power of the world socialist system and help to restrict the activity of major capitalist powers on the world market.

One of the key goals set by Rumania's economic development plan is to extend co-operation with CMEA countries by using diverse forms of production co-operation and technologies and by developing relations on the basis of long-term agreements making for the rapid progress of each socialist country.

O. T. Bogomolov, answering a question by J. Nkosi on how politics and economy interact in relations between socialist and capitalist countries, said that political detente is unquestionably an essential prerequisite of expanding business relations between countries belonging to different social systems. Besides, growing economic relations between socialist countries and developed capitalist and developing countries strengthen the economic foundations of peaceful coexistence and hence contribute to political detente. The task now is, evidently, to ensure that the provisions of the Final Act of the Helsinki Conference materialise, specifically in the economic field.

Bogomolov next pointed to another sphere of international relations where politics and economy interact very markedly—the struggle of socialist and developing countries for a reshaping of international economic relations.

Several speakers focussed attention on the international significance of the socialist countries' experience of the problem being discussed by the conference. Many countries following the path of socialist construction, Lhamsuren said, are now carrying out tasks similar to those faced by the Mongolian People's Republic in the past. Mongolia, Haba noted in this connection, is, indeed, no longer the only country to be advancing to socialism bypassing the capitalist stage of development. But it is a pioneer country in this respect and that is what makes its experience so valuable, in paricular to Iraq. This raises a number of questions of interest to the Communists of numerous developing countries. We all know, for instance, that the material prerequisites of socialism develop in economically backward countries after the working people have won political power. Evidently, a contradiction arises between an advanced political system and a backward economic basis. Could you, Haba asked Lhamsuren, tell us on the basis of your Party's experience about the difficulties that revolutionary power in Mongolia encountered and about the role that aid from the Soviet Union and other socialist countries played in overcoming them?

B. Lhamsuren: We had both objective and subjective difficulties. The main internal factor that held back Mongolia's development was its political, economic and cultural lag. That lag was ended in the main at the democratic stage, which lasted about twenty years. The people and the Party had to abolish feudal relations and eliminate the class of feudal lords. We had to fight for a long time against the clergy's domination of economic and spiritual life. Modern industries, transport, communications, a financial and economic system and cultural institutions were built almost from scratch. The process of forming a state sector showed distinctive features in this respect. Whereas developing socialist-orientated countries today set up a state sector chiefly by nationalising existing enterprises, Mongolia had to build them. And that is where Soviet aid played an invaluable part. Much credit is due to the first socialist country for the development of our national culture and the training of competent personnel of our own. The Soviet Union and other fraternal countries continue to render us

preements.

Along with this, our country had to go through certain adverse experiences. In ie late twenties, rightists in the Party leadership began to abandon the Party's :neral line geared to non-capitalist development, and in the early thirties, eftists" tried to decree certain socialist changes in the absence of appropriate onditions. The Party overcame those difficulties thanks to its close bonds with ie international Communist movement, especially with the CPSU.

Kohen spoke of two aspects of the international significance of the socialist ountries' experience in solving the problem of interaction between economy and olitics. First of all, he stressed that the economic struggle of the working class id gains in this struggle must not be dissociated from the main goal, which is to ke political power and establish a socialist state of the dictatorship of the oletariat. While reformists and bourgeois nationalists make an absolute of forms in the working-class movement of Argentina, the Communists insist that reforms within the framework of "social democracy", however far-reaching, in lead to real worker participation in the production process, let alone in the stribution of profits. This can be achieved, as the socialist countries' experience is shown, only when the working class has taken power. Economic democracy oes not lead to socialism; it is the socialist revolution that is a condition for :nuine people's rule and the masses' decisive participation in the management of oth economic and political affairs.

Secondly, Kohen said, it is wrong to imagine that elements of the basis and iperstructure of socialism are developing spontaneously in highly developed ipitalist countries. To be sure, he added, a high degree of concentration and :ntralisation of the means of production, which together constitute a suitable aterial, technical and economic basis for socialism, the existence of a numerous orking class personifying the social character of production and of competent anagerial and other leading personnel, a large network of working-class, trade iion, co-operative and other mass organisations, and above all, the activity of fluential and experienced Communist and Workers' parties are aspects of iblic life in capitalist countries that are now more pronounced than, say, 60 or) years ago. Nevertheless, these factors do not in themselves give rise to elements either the economic basis, or the political and ideological superstructure of cialism. Both the basis and the superstructure of socialist society are brought to being in severe class struggles in which the working class takes state power id thus sets out thoroughly to transform the economy.

In his closing remarks, Professor **Otto Reinhold**, Director of the Academy of ocial Sciences under the CC SUPG, stressed that the discussion had revealed implete unity on fundamental problems of the continued construction and :rfection of developed socialist society. The countries of the socialist immunity have entered a new stage of development in recent years. This stage insists, as the conference showed very clearly, in the fact that the humanist iture and conditions for the free development of the individual manifest emselves ever more effectively and distinctly.

Participants in the discussion, Reinhold said, raised numerous questions aring on every sphere of public life. Many of these questions were answered but any more were only just raised and require further study. I would like to point it only some aspects of the discussion which I believe are important from the int of view of summing it up.

The discussion showed that ever since the late sixties [illegible] our countries have been following a social development strategy that coincides in every respect. In spite of certain distinctions, our strategic goal is essentially the same, namely, building a developed socialist society. As for the Soviet Union, which has already accomplished this task, its strategic objective is to continue perfecting society, primarily by providing the material and technical basis for communism. But it is not only the common goal that we are unanimous on. This also applies, as the discussion re-emphasised, to the fundamental tasks to be fulfilled as the process goes on. We are at one on the growing leading role of the working class and its Marxist-Leninist party and agree that classes and strata are converging as the construction of a developed socialist society continues. Our positions regarding the inherent unity of the scientific and technological revolution and the advantages of socialism coincide too. We can say that we also take a common view of the fundamental problems of shaping the socialist way of life. This is a highly important aspect of socialist countries' drawing closer together along with economic integration and other processes.

Of course, we do not lose sight of the distinctions still there, both those arising from the application of general principles in concrete conditions and those due to other causes. But in spite of all these distinctions, the decisive thing is that the fraternal socialist countries are drawing closer and closer together and that distinctions are disappearing step by step as a developed socialist society is being built and perfected. This drawing together is only made possible by the fact that we proceed from general laws and that these laws are due to objective conditions.

Speaking of raising the people's standard of life and forming the socialist way of life, Reinhold said that we cannot fight for socialism without steadfastly improving the standard of living. On the other hand, we cannot speak of a socialist way of life and yet confine ourselves to meeting people's material requirements only. The point is to link these requirements with fast-growing satisfaction of people's spiritual and cultural needs, with lowering the incomes pyramid, shaping a new, socialist and communist attitude to work and heightening people's socialist consciousness.

Speakers in the discussion, Reinhold went on, pointed out that the present stage of our development is characterised by an interlocking and increasingly close dialectical interaction of diverse spheres of public life, by qualitatively new aspects of this interaction. In speaking of the unity of economic and social policy, we proceed from the fact that we have a new economic potential enabling us to carry out an ambitious social and political programme. It is just as correct to say that carrying out this socio-political programme today is a condition for releasing the forces needed to accelerate scientific and technological progress and solve economic problems.

It is a matter of international importance, Reinhold said, to see the ways and means of forming and perfecting a developed socialist society. The social essence, humanist character and qualitative advantages of socialism manifest themselves more and more while the general crisis of capitalism goes from bad to worse and the crisis of reformist, first of all social democratic and social reformist, policies becomes more and more evident. This means that by building or perfecting a developed socialist society in socialist countries, we have gradually evolved a modern conception of socialism in recent years. It has long been something more than a theory put to paper and is becoming a palpable reality, whereas reformist

th[illegible] "[illegible] socialism" and other "models" of socialism like it hav fallen through. I consider, therefore, that the theory and practice of the brothe countries' Communist parties are of tremendous significance also from this poin of view.

[1] See *WMR* for December 1970, August and December 1972, September 1973, January, Februar and March 1975 and February 1976.

The International Factor in Lenin's Theory of Revolution

ADAM WIRTH

Professor of the Higher Political School,
CC Hungarian Socialist Workers' Party

THE struggle for the revolutionary refashioning of society has always depended not only on internal but also on international conditions. Lenin's methodology of studying the revolution is based on a dialectical combination of a global approach that takes into account the laws governing the development of the imperialist system as a whole, the alignment of class forces in the world, with examination of the concrete conditions in each country.

This methodology rests on the ideas enunciated by the founders of scientific socialism, who saw in socialist revolution a worldwide process everywhere growing out of the contradictions of the capitalist formation. At the same time the methodology rests on analysis of the fundamental changes in the conditions of the class struggle wrought by capitalism's entry into the imperialist stage and the subsequent division of the world into two systems after the Great October Socialist Revolution, the 60th anniversary of which we shall be celebrating this year.

In the age of imperialism, Lenin pointed out, "the antagonism between internationally united capital and the international working class movement is brought into the forefront" (*Coll. Works*, Vol. 20, p. 401). In these conditions, too, of course, revolution matures primarily on national soil, but international conditions play a much more important role.

What do we understand by the international factor in Lenin's theory of revolution? In Marxist literature the accent is usually on the objective international conditions that influence the course and outlook of the revolution in an individual country, such as its place in the world, determined by the qualitative features of the epoch, the relation of class forces on a world scale, the chief element of which, after the October Revolution, is the relation between capitalism and socialism. And it should be emphasised in this context that in examining the international factor in the revolution, Lenin had in mind, besides the above-mentioned, the utilisation in national conditions of the experience of the revolutionary struggle of the international working class, generalised by scienctific theory, and also the international solidarity of the proletarian and other progressive forces ranged against imperialism. He emphasised that Communist policy must be based on an "appraisal of *all* the

class forces in a particular state (and of the states that surround it, and of all states the world over), as well as of the experience of revolutionary movements" (*Coll. Works*, Vol. 31, p. 63).

And so, the international factor has both objective and subjective aspects. In this article we shall try to show the topical validity of drawing on Lenin's ideas for a deeper understanding of the place and role of the international factor in the class confrontation of our day.

The significance of the international factor in Lenin's theory of revolution resides above all in the fact that it largely determines the concrete historical path of socialist revolution in the world.

Lenin's conception was formed in sharp struggle against the social-reformism and opportunism of the Second International leaders. Pleading the immaturity of the material-technical requisites for transition to socialism in countries with a middle or low level of capitalist development, including pre-revolutionary Russia, they tried to impose a taboo on working-class attempts to seize power in such countries. The fundamental methodological flaw of the Second International opportunitists' position *was their narrow, national view of the revolution*, with the socialist perspective in each country entirely dependent on its internal economic, technical and cultural conditions and potentialities.

"From the point of view of Marxism," Lenin wrote, "it is absurd to restrict oneself to conditions in one country alone" (Vol. 24, p. 238). It is important to bear in mind the development level of capitalism as a system. Inadequate development or even the absence in one or another country of the material prerequisites for socialism apply on an international scale too. For that reason alone it is inadmissible to take a passive contemplative view of the possibilities of transition to socialism. "To wait until the working classes carry out a revolution on an international scale means that everyone will remain suspended in mid-air. This is senseless" (Vol. 27, p. 372).

This approach, introduced by Lenin into the theory of socialist revolution, released the revolutionary initiative of the working class and opened wide vistas for the search of paths to socialism. Of special importance was the conclusion Lenin drew from the law of uneven economic and political development in the imperialist era, namely, that socialism could triumph "first in several or even in one capitalist country alone" (Vol. 21, p. 342). The operation of that law created also the international conditions for piercing the imperialist system at its weaker links. Lenin's conclusion played an enormous part in preparing the October Revolution. One cannot overestimate its value for the strategy of the international Communist movement.

The time-differential in the transition of various countries to socialism today, too, remains one of the most debated questions of ideological struggle. There have been repeated attempts to infuse new life into the old conceptions and dogmas of the Second International, so effectively refuted by Marxist-Leninist theory of revolution, and by revolutionary practice. And in these attempts one can distinguish two ideological and political objectives.

One is to palm off reformist conceptions as the genuine views of Marx and Engels and in this way not only weaken the attraction of Lenin's theory of revolution, but also discredit the October Revolution and the socialist revolutions that came after it. One example is provided by a recent item in *Le Monde*. One Robrieux, according to the paper, claims that the USSR

cannot be regarded as a socialist state, even if we accept that it has broken with capitalism", inasmuch as "Marx and Engels always regarded the establishment of socialism in one country alone as a sheer illusion".[1]

Another line of "argumentation" attempts to "prove" that the growing internationalisation of public life, imperialist alliances and blocs (with NATO at the head), collective neocolonialism and other forms of monopoly association place in question the very possibility of new breaches of the imperialist system in individual countries. The fact, however, is that Lenin's conclusion still holds good. For in present-day conditions there are a number of new factors that intensify the uneven development of capitalism: the scientific and technological revolution, state monopoly regulation, the wider gap in development levels between industrial and developing capitalist countries, contradictions between integration groupings. It should also be noted that the law of uneven development now operates at a time of confrontation of the two opposed systems, and with socialism now being the decisive factor in the development of mankind.

The transition to the socialist path by an individual country does not, of course, signify that in every case the international factor favours socialist revolution and consolidation of its gains. It can have the very opposite effect, acting as a brake on revolution.

This complex impact of the international factor on the conditions of class struggle in individual countries was clearly revealed by the Great October Socialist Revolution. The First World War weakened world imperialism and prevented it from organising a united front against the socialist revolution in Russia. The international proletariat had an active part in defending the young socialist state. And, of course, we all know the gigantic difficulties caused by foreign intervention, economic blockade and, subsequently, by development in conditions of capitalist encirclement. But Soviet Russia withstood this titanic battle with international reaction.

Things developed differently in the Hungarian socialist revolution. Due mainly to unfavourable international conditions, i.e., intervention by capitalist countries in support of internal reaction, Soviet power in Hungary, proclaimed in March 1919, was brought to an end later in that year despite the political and moral support of Soviet Russia, which at that time was locked in a life-and-death struggle against international imperialist intervention. A quarter of a century later, the much greater strength of the world's first socialist state, the defeat of fascism and the upsurge of the workers and democratic movement, prevented a repetition of the united front of internal counter-revolution and imperialism which had brought on the defeat of the Hungarian revolution. In the new historical setting the socialist revolution won final victory in Hungary.

The contradictory influence of the international factor on the national class struggle has to be reckoned with today, too. But the growth of the socialist forces, the upsurge of the class struggle and national-liberation movement have brought to the fore its more positive and constructive aspects.

The joint struggle of the peoples of the socialist community, the international working class and the national liberation movement finds its concentrated expression in the immense positive changes in international relations and in the progress towards detente. With the change of the forces balance in favour

of socialism it has become possible to [illegible] on principles of peaceful coexistence and detente.

Positive changes on the international scene also favour the class struggle the non-socialist part of the world. In the sixties—as has been demonstrat by the events in Cuba—imperialism's ability to export counter-revolution w greatly weakened. And in the seventies, with detente, the continued strenghe ing of socialism's international positions and the growth of the revolutiona forces, the peoples of Vietnam, Laos, Kampuchea, Angola and Mozambiq scored epochal victories.

Of course, international imperialism remains a serious adversary. It not onl holds back the advances of the forces of socialism, peace and progress, but, a the Chilean events and escalation of the rightist and fascist danger in oth Latin-American countries have shown, mounts counter-offensives. But, by an large, the international alignment of forces is developing in a way mor favourable for the struggle for socialism.

All this is evidence of the growing importance of the international factor i the revolutionary struggle and in social progress. And to that should be adde that today it plays a much bigger role than before. For in our time its opera tion can in many cases "compensate" for certain "shortcomings" in th internal development of countries (underdeveloped material and technical bas small working class, etc.), and lessen the difficulties in building socialism. Th inadequate maturity of the internal material prerequisites for socialism can b compensated by consistent orientation on alliance with the countries of th socialist community. As Leonid Brezhnev has noted: "If we examine all thes difficulties in isolation from the international situation, they might appea insurmountable. But the fact of the matter is that today the birth and victor of socialist revolution proceeds in conditions when socialism has become th dominant direction in the development of mankind."

But even in these new, more favourable conditions for socialism, Lenin' conclusion that revolution is not brought in from without retains all its validit The earnest of success in the fight for the socialist transformation of societ is a correct policy of the Communist Party, its ability creatively to apply th general principles of Marxism-Leninism in adaptation to the specific con ditions in its own country, and unite the majority of the people around th working class. The victory of revolution and consolidation of its gains ar possible only given unity of internal and international conditions an prerequisites.

Lenin regarded revolutionary experience as the common property of a Communists, a necessary condition for the development of the world Com munist movement and each of its detachments. Revolutionary policy, h pointed out, "demands, first, that the experience of other countries be take into account, especially if these other countries, which are also capitalist, ar undergoing or have recently undergone, a very similar experience" (Vol. 31 pp. 80-81). That is why attention and care must be shown for every morsel c the revolutionary experience of Marxist-Leninist parties. It is well known tha Marx, Engels and Lenin constantly referred to the experience of the revolu tionary movement as an inexhaustible source of revolutionary theory. Th question arises, however, in what sense can historical experience be considere as a component of the international factor?

In connection with this Lenin's appraisal of the international significance of the Great October Socialist Revolution is important in principle. Lenin saw two aspects of its importance. First of all, from the viewpoint of its revolutionary impact on mankind's development. And, secondly, from the viewpoint of a repetition of the main aspects of the October revolution in subsequent socialist revolutions. Summing up the experience of the October Revolution and the first years of socialist construction in Russia, Lenin pointed out that "certain fundamental features of our revolution have a significance that is not local, or peculiarly national or Russian alone, but international" (Vol. 31, p. 21).

To profit from experience means seeing in every historical event not only its individual, inimitable peculiarities, but mainly its traits of common significance. Besides mastering universal experience, Lenin pointed out, it is important to study the history of the class struggle in one's own country.

Therefore, the experience of this or that contingent of the workers' movement acquires worldwide significance, thanks to its internationalisation, the creative mastering by each party of all of value that has been accumulated in the practice of the class struggle in other countries and the world over. Comprehending the most important laws which are but a summation of social practice and leaning on them in practical activities is an important factor accelerating society's revolutionary transformation. And, conversely, whenever the most important natural laws are underestimated or ignored, the revolutionary process is slowed down and may even face a crisis.

It is important to stress that in disclosing the international significance of the essential traits of the first victorious proletarian revolution, Lenin took into account accumulated international experience. In particular, he showed that the experience of the Hungarian Soviet Republic proclaimed in 1919 helps to more clearly see the laws of the proletarian revolution and to separate them from its concrete manifestations in one or another country. A comparative analysis of the peculiarities of the proletarian revolution in Russia and in Hungary promotes a better understanding of the essence of proletarian power. Referring to the experience of Soviet Hungary, Lenin stressed the impermissibility of identifying aspects of "Russian Soviet government, of the history of its development in Russia, with Soviet government as an international phenomenon" (Vol. 29, p. 388). The sharpness of the Russian class struggle during the first years of the revolution made it difficult to understand the essence of the turn effected in the country from a bourgeois to a proletarian democracy, to understand the essence of dictatorship of the proletariat including its Soviet form, which consisted not of force alone, or even mainly of force, but in organising the masses in creative endeavour to transform society, in the organisation and discipline of the working class as the vanguard detachment of working people.

Such an approach, founded on the unity of the general laws of the revolution and the different ways of carrying it out, differs in principle from the approach attributed to Marxists-Leninists by their opponents claiming that they supposedly proceed from a prejudiced "model" of socialism restraining a free choice of roads to socialism. Lenin's theory of revolution is incompatible with a mechanical transfer from one country to another of the tactics and methods of struggle. It is impossible to work out one's own, effective policy

by copying the experience of others. It is equally [illegible] cannot be done by ignoring world experience, not using its positive aspects and not heeding its mistakes in order not to repeat them.

The richer and more varied the experience upon which strategy and tactics of struggle are built in one or another country, the more opportunities are there for a conscious selection of paths and forms of struggle. Underestimating experience cannot but lead to belittling the role of theory to the method of trial and error. Fidel Castro said in his report to the First Congress of the CP of Cuba that one of the lessons of the Cuban revolution was that it showed once again how important it was for revolutionaries to "subordinate their actions to the laws of historical and social development, to draw the knowledge necessary to guide the revolutionary process from the inexhaustible well of political science and world experience".

Every epoch has its own inimitable pecularities, every country its own distinctions influencing its path to socialism. But a scientific approach always extends beyond a simple statement of the individuality of historical events, and helps the researcher in the multitude of events to see the unity of their socio-class essence. At the base of the similarity of historical processes in different countries, even those separated by a more or less prolonged interval of time, is the repetitiveness of history, the reproductivity in various concrete historical conditions of the more essential bonds and relations. This common sociological law affects the processes of the revolutionary restructuring of capitalist society. Applied to the socialist revolution it means that the experience of the first large, independent class actions by the proletariat, the more so of socialist revolutions, could not but disclose such traits and characteristics whose significance extends beyond their time.

The history of all socialist revolutions carried out after October showed that, despite the peculiarities of each, certain basic traits of the first victorious proletarian revolution are repeated. And there are no grounds to believe that they will not be confirmed by future socialist revolutions.

In stressing the fundamental importance of internationalising the experience gained by the international working-class and Communist movement, we mean both past experience and the experience of the present-day struggle of the international working class for democracy and socialism. A notable characteristic of the contemporary stage of social development is the growing role of the example of the socialist community, the revolutionising impact of its economic, political and cultural achievements. This is what makes dissemination of the truth about socialism so important now. The objective panorama of today's life in socialist countries, on reaching the masses, becomes an effective means of promoting the world revolutionary process, an essential factor in providing favourable ideological conditions for social progress in the non-socialist part of the world.

Proletarian internationalism is more expressive than anything else of the positive content of the international factor in the Leninist theory of the revolution. The revolutionary forces' mutual solidarity and support make it possible to use for the advancement of the revolution on national soil the new opportunities afforded by the new balance of world forces. At the same time they create new international conditions and relations meeting the peoples' aspirations. In this sense, proletarian internationalism is not merely a com-

ponent but the core and substance of the Leninist conception of the international factor.

All major events in the history of the revolutionary working-class movement have taken place under the tremendous and constant impact of proletarian internationalism and have at the same time stimulated and contributed to its development. This is only logical, for proletarian internationalism is at once a prerequisite and a result of the development of the international revolutionary movement of the working class. Proletarian solidarity is inseparable from the social essence, fundamental interests and historic goals of the Communist and working-class movement.

This is why each time the working-class movement entered a new stage of development, problems of internationalism became highly relevant and pressing in view of the exigencies of revolutionary practice. In today's conditions, the need to strengthen the international unity of revolutionary forces is due to the new and higher level of internationalisation of the class struggle, the process of reshaping the whole system of international relations now going on and the inner logic of development of the world Communist movement. This need is all the more imperative because imperialism actively co-ordinates, at international level, its actions against socialism and the international working-class and national liberation movement.

Speaking at the Berlin Conference of Communist and Workers' Parties of Europe, Janos Kadar, First Secretary of the CC HSWP, said that "today, when the world Communist movement has no centre or leading party and when the brother parties shape their own tactics and strategy, it is particularly important to preserve the purity of Marxist-Leninist theory, assess the experience of practice in theoretical terms and apply the principle of proletarian internationalism". All this shows the importance of studying problems of internationalism and of searching for new ways and means of carrying it into practice with due regard to the overall situation on the world and in each particular country. In accomplishing these tasks, Lenin's time-tested methodological principles of analysing the place and role of international solidarity in the class struggle play an important part.

What are the main characteristics of the Leninist approach to the problem of proletarian internationalism? We will try to outline some of them.

First, *historical necessity*. Lenin deduced the content, objectives and forms of international solidarity from the characteristics of the given epoch, the nature of the revolutionary process, and the place and role of the working class in it. He showed that to be an internationalist means, above all, fighting for the common interests and ideals of the working class, the central force of the epoch. Nowadays the decisive role of the chief creation of the international working class—the states of the socialist community—is becoming ever more tangible. This objectively brings to the fore the tasks of fostering co-operation between the working class, the forces of peace, social progress and national liberation and the socialist community. History has repeatedly demonstrated that to dissociate internationalism from revolutionary practice, from the tasks and goals prompted by the nature of the revolutionary process in this or that epoch, and underestimate the role of the working class as the chief revolutionary force of today is to turn internationalism into something abstract and

non-committal, into what Lenin called "internationalism in word" (Vol. 24, p. 74).

Second, *mutual connection* with the activity of all progressive forces opposed to imperialism. The slogan "Workers of all lands, unite" is expressive of the very substance of proletarian internationalism, but by no means covers its entire content. The social revolution as seen by Lenin is a whole epoch of class battles in every sphere of public life, an epoch made up of the revolutionary struggle of the international proletariat, the peoples oppressed by imperialism, all the social classes and groups exploited by capitalism, and general democratic movements. Those who look forward to a "pure" social revolution, Lenin said, will not live to see it. Credit is due to Lenin for fully revealing the revolutionary potentialities of non-proletarian strata and democratic movements.

This Leninist postulate, which takes account of the fact that the social basis of internationalism is expanding in step with the social content and motive forces of the revolution in the twentieth century, has been, and remains, a dependable guide to a correct solution of the problem of the relationship between proletarian internationalism and the international solidarity of other anti-imperialist forces. Proletarian internationalism today is inseparable from democratic and anti-imperialist solidarity, from solidarity in the struggle for peace and detente. It is important to realise, however, that the growing significance of international solidarity in support of the solution of general democratic problems is not a result of minimising the role of proletarian internationalism.

Third, Lenin approached the content and forms of international solidarity *dialectically*, with due regard to their renewal and enrichment by practice. He was emphatically against making an absolute of this or that concrete historical form or method of applying proletarian internationalism, against reducing it to these forms or methods. Posing "old" and new forms of solidarity against each other is incompatible with Lenin's approach to internationalism which combines the unity of the class essence of internationalism with creative quests, with constant renewal and enrichment of the forms of international solidarity according to national and international conditions. When this methodological principle is abandoned the rise of new forms of solidarity may be mistaken for a kind of "rejection" of the very essence of proletarian internationalism.

Fourth, *concreteness*, taking account of the situation in the world and the country concerned in defining the content and form of international solidarity. The international cohesion of the socialist countries, fraternal mutual assistance, and multilateral constructive co-operation are all a most important international condition for building socialism in our country. Accordingly, internationalism to the HSWP means primarily strengthening the cohesion of the socialist community. Our party attaches special importance to continuous consolidation of the deep-going and firm friendship with the Soviet Union.

A contingent of the international Communist movement, the HSWP works for strengthening it on Marxist-Leninist principles. Its relations with the national democratic movements in Asia, Africa and Latin America are expanding. Its policy of fostering international solidarity with all progressive forces the world over helps to build socialism in our country. In turn, gains

in building socialism in Hungary serve the interests of both the Hungarian people and all socialist countries, the cause of peace and social progress.

Fifth and last, the *actively transforming* role of proletarian internationalism. The Communists are not passive onlookers but active builders of a new international situation and new forms of international solidarity in the struggle for peace and social progress. This was the case at the beginning of this century, when the victory of the Great October opened a new chapter in man's history, and during World War II, when the Communist movement and the world's first socialist country made the greatest sacrifices to ensure the victory of the peoples and achieve peace.

It is also the case today, when the Communist and Workers' Parties declare for firmly establishing the practice of peaceful coexistence and champion national liberation and social progress. The more they operate as a solidly united force, the more important is their contribution to the effort to attain these great and noble aims.

The international factor is acquiring a new quality in today's revolutionary process. Never before has the class struggle on national soil been so closely linked with the evolution of international relations, the worldwide contest between socialism and capitalism and the struggle for peace and international security. Lenin foresaw the gigantic growth today of the international tasks of the working class. It is only natural, therefore, that scholars are concerned with investigating the international factor in Lenin's theory of the revolution.

---

[1] *Le Monde*, November 26, 1976. Similar views have been actively disseminated by renegades of Marxism and anti-Marxists. I, Deutscher, one of the theoreticians of Trotskyism, says in his "The Unfinished Revolution. Russia 1917-1967" (London, 1968) that the concept of different countries coming to socialism at different times is a product of national narrow-mindedness and a betrayal of proletarian internationalism. The "dramatic break" of Communist Parties loyal to Leninism "with the classical Marxian model of revolution" will be found in the writings of F. Marek (cf. his *Philosophie der Weltrevolution*. Wien-Frankfurt-Zürich, 1966).

The Validity of Proletarian Internationalism

IB NØRLUND

Member of the Executive and Secretary, CC CP Denwark

THE validity and topicality of proletarian internationalism, how it accords with the content, forms and tasks of party activity, is being discussed in our party. The attitude to proletarian internationalism has played a decisive role in the development of our party. Our firm fidelity to its principles assured its continued existence and a new upsurge after the most difficult periods of its history. In the present situation, too, this attitude is of crucial importance in resolving our problems. This follows from the specifics at the present stage of the class struggle in Denmark and from its peculiar political situation in

Europe, as a small country whose ruling [illegible] it into NA[illegible] and the Common Market.

Our Party Chairman, Comrade Jespersen, said at the Conference [illegible] *European Communist and Workers' Parties: "Marx defined the basis of [illegible] Communist movement in the words 'Workers of All Lands, Unite!' Th[illegible] working-class internationalism became an increasingly decisive factor [illegible] uniting the popular forces, irrespective of national frontiers, when their vit[illegible] interests were at stake and when new social solutions had to be found. It[illegible] importance is still greater today, when economic and political developmen[illegible] have internationalised a large number of problems."[1] In this and other areas,* Marxist-Leninist policy must, naturally, undergo constant renewal, in line with the requirements and tasks of the international Communist and the entire anti-imperialist movement. And of prime importance here is the need to take account of the objective demands the new situation makes on proletarian internationalism, not only in our continent, but throughout the world.

Today, the problems of proletarian internationalism are especially closely interconnected. Drawing on our experience, we can single out some of the most essential directions along which we are endeavouring to concretise our party's internationalism. We have in mind the following: attitude to existing socialism, the Soviet Union, the first land of socialism, and other socialist countries, which in our country implies actively combating anti-Sovietism and anti-Communism; support of the struggle of oppressed peoples and of the progressive strivings of the young independent states; defence of the socialist, national and general democratic gains of the people of every country; solidarity in the anti-fascist and anti-monopoly struggle, in the movement for international security, for a durable and just peace, for a world without the thermonuclear menace, a world of equal relations and co-operation between all states. We believe that this attitude will strengthen the international ties that unite our party with the international Communist movement. And it is on this basis that we are developing comradely co-operation with all fraternal parties.

In discussing how our party understands its internationalist duty, our attention was drawn, in particular, to the article by Antonio Rubbi, Central Committee member of the Italian Communist Party, "The New Internationalism," published for discussion in the January issue of this journal. The author emphasises the need to bring the Communists' internationalist policy into line with the new realities of the modern world.

Of course, there are many points in the article with which we agree. But I regret to say that I cannot accept its main proposition: contrasting the "new internationalism" to proletarian internationalism. But it is one thing to signify one's disagreement with the author and quite another to show why, in our opinion, he is wrong. Since views differing from those of Comrade Rubbi have already appeared on the pages of this journal,[2] I would like to confine these notes to certain fundamental questions the author dwells upon in substantiating his idea of a "new internationalism".

We agree with him that in any discussion one should concentrate on correctly presenting the subject. Let us see how it is presented by Comrade Rubbi.

"Internationalism," he writes, "must be linked with the cardinal problems facing the world, with due account of the requirements of national realities.

...would have but one fate: it would degenerate into ineffectual propaganda unrelated even to concrete manifestations of solidarity, and would be distant and alien to the working class and the broad masses of working people."

We, too, believe that the Communists' internationalism cannot be divorced from the class interests of the working people and the national interests of each people, from solution of world and national problems in accordance with these interests. And, as we all know, there is concord and agreement on this in the international Communist movement. More, the Communist movement has worked out common platforms of struggle for peace, democracy, national independence and socialism that accord with the peoples' interests. This was done, for example, at the 1969 Moscow International Meeting and also at regional conferences and bilateral meetings between many fraternal parties.

In Rubbi's view, internationalism, if it is to accord with the social realities of the present-day world, must acquire a new content. Internationalism today, in his opinion, is necessary, first, to preserve peace, extend detente, repell the forces of war, aggression and imperialism. Second, it is necessary for solving the vast and intricate complex of questions involved in asserting the self-determination of peoples who have won political independence and their equitable relations and co-operation with the developed countries. Third, it is necessary for resolving problems concerning the whole of mankind (demography, hunger, environmental protection, the consequences of elemental calamities).

"Such, very largely is the new content, we believe, of action on an international scale," Comrade Rubbi concludes.

The cardinal importance of these international problems for the destinies of mankind is beyond doubt. The effort to resolve them in the interests of the people is an important part of the Communists' internationalist duty. And in this respect, too, we can note that our views are identical with those of the author.

But this raises the question: is it right to contrast this substance of internationalism, as something "new", to proletarian internationalism? In our view there are no grounds for that. If we were to assume that Rubbi believes that the "old content" of internationalism was confined merely to the struggle for socialism and that past international actions ignored the tasks and aims he lists, then we could understand his attitude. But the fact of the matter is that this is not so.

Proletarian internationalism organically combines socialist and general democratic aims. For proletarian internationalism includes general democratic solutions of the world's problems. Beginning with the Communist League and the First International, the workers' and Communist movement, while working towards the socialist transformation of society, has always fought for the fullest and most consistent implementation of democracy in international relations, striving for the "simple laws of morality and justice . . . to become the supreme laws also in relations between nations". And the movement has followed that line in all the subsequent years, right up to our days. More, it is generally conceded (and this Rubbi does not deny) that today, too, proletarian internationalism has acquired greater scope and scale and is tackling greater problems of a general democratic character. It presupposes disinterested sup-

port of all progressive forces in their anti-imperialist struggle in all its form
(national-liberation and democratic movements, anti-fascist resistance, th
movements for peace and security).

The Rubbi article further stresses that "the biggest contribution a party ca
make to internationalism is determined by what it does, independently an
concretely in its own field of battle, to promote detente, new internationa
relations and the independence and progress of the peoples. Independen
elaboration of problems and of political activity is also a necessary conditio
for the continuing world struggle for socialism in the new internationa
situation."

We believe that this presentation of the question of the main contributio
each party makes to internationalism is, in general, correct. But here, too
there is nothing novel, nothing that is not contained in proletarian inter
nationalism. Marxists have always believed that each party makes its mai
contribution to the international cause of the working class primarily "in it
own field of battle". More than half a century ago Lenin wrote that being a
internationalist means doing "the utmost possible in one country *for* th
development, support and awakening of the revolution *in all countries* . . ."
it means doing "everything possible to promote the international socialis
movement, to secure and shorten the road leading mankind to deliveranc
from the yoke of capital and from wage slavery, to the creation of a sociali
society and to an enduring just peace between the peoples" (*Coll. Work*
Vol. 28, p. 292, and Vol. 27, p. 201).

Proletarian internationalism includes also definite norms of relations betwee
the parties, and they change with the development of the Communist move
ment. The article lays special stress on this problem. In defining the "ne
internationalism" the author writes that it "essentially implies the need fo
new relations based on recognition of the autonomy and equality of eac
party as set out in the final document of the European Conference of Com
munist and Workers' Parties".

We know, however, that the norms now accepted by the Communist an
Workers' parties in relations with each other, including independenc
(autonomy) and equality of each party, were worked out and proclaimed lon
before the Berlin Conference.[3]

They have become part and parcel of the Communist movement. Would
not be more correct, therefore, to say that the Berlin Conference reaffirme
the norms of inter-party relations accepted by all, and not only by th
European Communist parties?

It would therefore be hard to detect in the "new internationalism" som
thing really "new" that is not part of proletarian internationalism. Instead c
counterposing to proletarian internationalism its own principles, disguised as
"new content", it would have been more correct to say that the "new inte
nationalism" has "borrowed" such and such from proletarian internationalis
and single out controversial points. For our aim is mutual understanding, n
more disagreement.

And so, we have no differences over what the "new internationalism
"borrows" from proletarian internationalism. We differ with Rubbi on oth
points.

As we understand him, he is concerned not with proletarian internationalis

but with internationalism in general, with no definite class facets. Rubbi believes that internationalism has acquired a new quality not much because of its aims, but because of its participants. In assessing the social forces prepared to fight for positive solution of the international problems he writes: "The working class remains the main force, but now within an unprecedentedly varied and broad range of other social forces" and further, "with the new scope of the movement developing in the world, we believe that the definition of internationalism as 'proletarian' has become restrictive and does not accord with the new social reality."

In short, though the working class is the *main force*, i.e. the main motive power of international solidarity, nonetheless the author believes that the "*scope of the movement*" is the main thing in internationalism.

In our view, using the composition of participants or the "scope of the movement" to define the essence of internationalism is of dubious value. The character of internationalism is determined not by the narrowness or the breadth of the movement, but by the orientation of solidarity actions and their ultimate results. For instance, the proletarian substance of the Communists' internationalism is determined by the fact that it expresses the philosophy and policy of the revolutionary working class and pursues a definite aim, namely, of replacing capitalist by socialist social relations.

Why, then, does this internationalism not accord with the "new social reality"?

In arguing his case, Rubbi writes that capitalist society "can no longer, of course, be characterised by the schematic division into 'bourgeoisie' and 'proletariat' ". Everywhere, we are told, there is "pluralism".

In other words, the division of society into bourgeoisie and proletariat is being replaced by "pluralism". Is that really so? Does the "new social reality" differ from the one in which the slogan of proletarian internationalism was proclaimed.

We know that in the past, too, the movement for national liberation, democracy and peace covered a wide spectrum of social forces, political positions and philosophical orientations. The policy of alliances is not new to the Communist movement in its national and international fight for the workers' cause and for democratic aims. But the Communists' alliance policy has never meant renouncing, or minimising, their fundamental aims or concepts. That precisely is why the Communist movement has come to play such a decisive part in the struggle of the working class and people for democracy and socialism.

Reference to history does not therefore confirm the author's thought. "Pluralism" existed always in capitalist society, along with its division into bourgeoisie and proletariat, along with the antagonism between these two classes.

The growing public activity of non-proletarian strata does not lead today, any more than it did in the past, to this antagonism ceasing to be decisive under capitalism or becoming a matter of secondary importance in comparison with "pluralism". On the contrary, we believe the role of this antagonism has grown in the context of our epoch, whose central factor is the international working class and its main achievement, the world socialist system. This is why the significance of precisely the proletarian class tendency

of internationalism has grown too. Indeed, formerly, in the epoch of the upward trend of capitalism, the concrete historical content of general democratic tasks consisted, at least in Europe, in struggle against feudalism and its heritage, and their fulfilment contributed in one way or another to the progress of bourgeois society. In the proletarian internationalism of that epoch, the anti-capitalist aspirations of the working class were combined with a similar content of the general democratic tasks. In our epoch, the epoch of transition from capitalism to socialism, the movement for democracy, national liberation and peace has acquired a new, anti-imperialist and anti-monopoly content. This has necessarily impinged on proletarian internationalism and strengthened its class tendency.

In speaking of the content of internationalism, anyone who discounts the fact that the working class is now the central factor of the epoch is undoubtedly calling the proletarian character of internationalism into question. But in that case no common basis is left for discussion of internationalism. However, the author of the article does not dispute this fundamental fact.

Antonio Rubbi interprets proletarian internationalism as something "objectively restricting the unitarian appeal". But in what way does proletarian internationalism restrict the Communists' call for unity?

The Italian author writes that "not all the forces working for world peace, international co-operation and social progress are prepared immediately to join the battle for socialist transformations".

It is true that not all supporters of democracy and social progress are prepared to fight for socialism, and experience shows that not all of them adopt this position. It is also true that the Communist appeal for unity must take this circumstance into account. But how does it do that? This appeal, which is expressive of the Communists' class position, is not conditional on the demand that those to whom it is directed should renounce their ideological positions. Why, then, condition it by reducing the Communists' internationalism to the level of the aspirations of those who are not prepared to fight for socialism?

A. Rubbi writes that among the "forces capable of renewing society and transforming it along socialist lines" there are also political trends "that are beyond the framework of the Communist parties, some even beyond the framework of Marxist-oriented parties". He adds that "the demand for socialism is also growing within other political trends". This leads him to the conclusion that one cannot "prescribe for the movement common and universal laws for developing the socialist revolution and building socialist society".

But does the Communists' appeal for unity directed to other, non-Communist forces really imply that these forces must by all means recognise the general development laws of the revolution and of socialism? To affirm such a thing would, in our view, be at variance with the actual state of affairs. To be sure, solidarity in the case of the Communists is based on their having one and the same ideology, a common ideology—Marxism-Leninism—which connotes understanding the laws of the socialist revolution and socialist construction. But even among the workers, not everyone fully understands these laws or has attained to scientific socialism. Nevertheless, they take an active part in extending solidarity to peoples fighting for socialism.

It has been said that today the slogans of international solidarity include many general democratic demands. Unquestionably, they can be (and are) supported by forces very far removed from the Communists. Nor does this imply at all that they recognise or understand the general laws of the revolution and of socialism. This is a common fact now, a reality of today. However, A. Rubbi apparently presumes that the fact that non-Communist forces refuse to recognise this or that important thesis of scientific socialism should prompt the Communists to renounce these theses. Should it? Does it really follow that a correct understanding of the laws of transition to socialism is a hindrance to unity while their denial is a unifying factor?

A. Rubbi advocates a strategy for the advance to socialism meeting "the conditions and requirements of the given society". There is no disagreement between us on this point. But the experience of the Communist movement suggests that such a strategy can only be evolved in accordance with general laws and with due regard to the distinctive character of the situation.

To back his renunciation of proletarian internationalism, A. Rubbi even refers to authorities.

"At the Berlin Conference," he writes, "we rose above this formula."

As a participant in the Conference, I would like to say here that one cannot correctly explain in this way the Conference discussion of the issue of proletarian internationalism. This also follows from the Conference speeches by the parties' spokesmen, and as for our party, its position is made clear by what has already been said here.

A most important result of the Conference was that it evolved a common platform for the Communists of Europe on the issues of the struggle for peace and social progress, and specified the aims whose attainment "would constitute an important advance along the road leading to the transformation of Europe into a continent of peace, security, co-operation and social progress" [4] In line with these aims and with all participants concurring, the Conference decided on forms of solidarity corresponding to the present state of the European Communist movement.

Concerning international comradely and voluntary co-operation and solidarity, the Conference states that the parties attending it would develop them "on the basis of the great ideas of Marx, Engels and Lenin, strictly adhering to the principles of equality and sovereign independence of each party, non-interference in internal affairs, and respect for their free choice of different roads in the struggle for social change of a progressive nature and for socialism. The struggle of each party for socialism in its own country and its responsibility towards the working class and the people of that country are bound up with mutual solidarity among working people of all countries and all progressive movements and peoples in their struggle for freedom and the strengthening of their independence, for democracy, socialism and world peace."[5]

This entitles us to make the following points in respect of the problem under discussion. First, the statement underlines the ideological basis of Communist solidarity—the ideas of Marx, Engels and Lenin—and defines the standards of relations between parties. Second, it stresses the main and decisive thing in the activity of each Communist party and in its class position, namely, the struggle for socialism. Third, it stresses the responsibility of each party for the

socialist cause in the country concerned, its initiative and independent choice of the path to socialism. Fourth, it links this struggle to achieving both socialist and general democratic goals all over the world. These points are in harmony with our party's conception of proletarian internationalism even though its present-day content is not, of course, restricted to them. Hence to say that the Conference "rose above" or "overcame" the formula of proletarian internationalism means at the very least interpreting very loosely both the document adopted by the Conference and the positions of the participants, including the position of our party.

Before concluding, I wish to note so as to avoid all misunderstanding that I do not consider the controversial issues to which I have necessarily given so much attention in these remarks to be a hindrance to mutual understanding. For what is controversial is, in effect, the study of what A. Rubbi describes as "still far from completed". Changes in the world situation will undoubtedly continue to give rise to debates before they find reflection in theory. There is nothing unnatural about this. But we think it is important in any debate not to lose common ground. And I would like to stress that we see this common ground in the document approved by the Conference of European Communists, in the realisation of the need of the brother parties' solidarity and voluntary comradely co-operation in the struggle for peace, detente, democracy, national independence and socialism, of the need closely to link this struggle in our country with a similar struggle in other countries and regions. This is the main thing.

---

[1] *Land of Folk*, June 30, 1976.

[2] In the January and February issues of *WMR*.

[3] cf. Statement of the 1960 Moscow Conference of Communist and Workers' Parties; International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties, Moscow, 1969.

[4] "For Peace, Security, Co-operation and Social Progress in Europe", in *WMR*, August 1976, p. 7.

[5] Ibid., p. 4.

Social Reality and the Socialist Ideal

RADOVAN RICHTA

Corresponding member, Czechoslovak Academy of Sciences

EDUARD BATALOV

Soviet philosopher

THE clash of social ideals that has accompanied the entire history of class society, continues today with mounting force. More, the battle between two social ideals—socialist and bourgeois—is becoming truly global in character, spreading to all spheres of human endeavour.

For all its dynamisms and complexity, the general trend of this battle is leaning towards the socialist ideal which is gaining new ground, particularly among the younger generation in the capitalist and developing countries. This is due in many respects to the achievements of existing socialism, the direction

and character of the home and foreign policies of the socialist countries and the many-faceted creative activities of Communist and Workers' parties. Socialism, built in a number of countries, has become, in a way, the *material base for the socialist social ideal*. At the same time, the growing influence of the socialist ideal throughout the world is objectively helping develop and consolidate existing socialism.

The imperialist bourgeoisie is well aware of this when planning the strategy and tactics of its struggle against socialism. It is no secret that bourgeois ideologues have always and inevitably tried to discredit socialism with the most varied methods and approaches. Attempts are made to belittle and downgrade the achievements of socialist construction, to vulgarise and falsify the socialist ideal and to present the difficulties and shortcomings encountered in building socialism as well-night the law governing socialism. The bourgeois press has always tried to depict socialism as either a nightmare (in the spirit of Aldous Huxley's and George Orwell's antiutopia[1]), or as an unattainable utopia. Today, this seems to point to our critics' intention *of "divorcing" the socialist ideal from existing socialism* and attempting to prove that supposedly the "genuine" socialist ideal has nothing in common with existing socialism. This is due to both the growing appeal of the socialist ideal and the unpopularity of direct criticism of socialism from traditional private-ownership positions—bourgeois mentality today seems to favour "liberal" reformist ideas. Essentially this criticism does not change, and continues its efforts to force the masses away from the clear road of revolutionary struggle for socialism, obscure its goals, portraying the means of attaining these goals as indefinite and hazy.

Certain "neo-Marxist" and "left" critics of capitalism, motivated by other considerations, adhere to a position that is objectively close to this. Though they do not reject the socialist ideal, they campaign for a "new society", for "genuine" socialism ("humane", "democratic", with a human face", etc.), placing the abstract ideal of their own construction *in opposition* to existing socialism. They dispute not only the idea of continuity in the development of the socialist ideal, but the very possibility of relying, in its embodiment, on the experience accumulated in the building of socialism. In "An Essay on Liberation" Herbert Marcuse writes: ". . . The possibilities of the new society are sufficiently 'abstract', i.e., removed from and incongruous with the established universe to defy any attempt to identify them in terms of this universe."[2] "To restore its full meaning to the concept of socialist ethics," writes the French philosopher Maximilien Rubel, "let us add that socialism is either consciousness of Utopia, or it is nothing."[3]

So, from many sides and differing positions, it is suggested that the adherents of the socialist (communist) ideal start from the beginning. Let us not believe anyone or anything, they are admonished, let us start from scratch and create everything.

This prompts us to turn directly to the question of the nature of the socialist social ideal, its ties with social reality, first of all with existing socialism.

In the early years of their co-operation the founders of scientific communism, Marx and Engels, wrote in *The German Ideology*: "Communism is for us not a *state of affairs* which is to be established, an *ideal* to which reality

[will] have to adjust itself. We call communism the real movement which abolishes the present state of things."

Is this a sign of a nihilistic approach by the founders of Marxism to the socialist and communist social ideal? Certainly not. An attentive reader of Marxist classics will find in this and their other works the thought that from the viewpoint of materialistic conception of history, human activity, because it has a definite purpose, is precisely *activity in the name of an ideal and in accordance with an ideal*. Hence the recognition of the essential role played in the history of social development by the social, primarily socialist, ideal, best developed in the pre-Marxian period by utopian socialism. It is not accidental that the latter served as one of the theoretical sources of Marxism. What the founders of scientific communism did reject were attempts to picture socialism (communism) not as an existing historical necessity emerging from the contradictions of capitalist society (from the "real movement"), but as an abstract ideal growing out of the equally abstract "human nature" and its "absolute freedom". In other words, Marx and Engels rejected the interpretation of a social ideal in terms of idealistic philosophy, and its treatment of the nature of the ties between the ideal and social reality.[4]

Marx and Engels broke radically with the preceding tradition of speculative construction of the ideal as an abstract, out-of-time *perfection*, a desired social *limit* and, consequently, a moral and political imperative. Possibly, such a "heavenly" ideal is good, but it is more important for it to be "earthly", their deliberations on this subject suggest. For this, however, the social ideal must not only express the real requirements that have matured within society and are understood by a part of society, it must also correspond to the objective, natural tendency of social development. In other words, the social ideal is "earthly" and effective when it is "deduced" not from the philosopher's mind, even though it may be an excellent mind, but from the real historical movement of society itself. This is the image of the *necessary* future, emerging as a result of resolving the contradictions of the given society.

The Marxist socialist ideal is the result of an analysis of the practice of social struggle, of the contradictions inherent in capitalist society. Lenin stressed: "There is no trace of utopianism in Marx, in the sense that he made up or invented a 'new' society. No, he studied the *birth* of the new society *out of* the old . . . as a natural-historical process" (*Coll. Works*, Vol. 25, p. 425). Such is the first fundamental distinction of the Marxist interpretation of the social ideal from all preceding ones, following logically from the materialistic interpretation of history.

The second distinction is connected with a dialectical understanding of the ideal itself or, to be more exact, of its "life", its functioning in society. Socialism is not something immutable, something given once and for all, "it should be conceived in a state of constant flux and change", wrote Engels (K. Marx, F. Engels, *Selected Works*, Vol. 3, p. 485). The socialist ideal *develops* with the social reality which gives birth to it and "nourishes" it, with the revolutionary forces which impart to it a deeper and richer meaning, as it is being materialised. The rate and extent to which the socialist ideal is developed and directly dependent on both the level attained by society as it starts its progress towards socialism (communism), and the circumstances in which the ideal is being materialised.

These features, we believe, distinguish the scientifically grounded and practically verified ideal from any utopia or speculative scheme.

But, supposing for a minute that we agree with those who, for one reason or another, insist that existing scientific theory and experience be disregarded, that we start from the beginning.

What can be achieved by starting from zero, so to say? One of two things. If, starting from scratch, we nevertheless decided to construct the ideal we are seeking, on the basis of the objective tendencies of social development, on a scientific basis, we shall inevitably arrive at that very same Marxist socialist ideal which we first attempted to discard. If we wished, however, to construct an arbitrary ideal of an "omni-blessed" society, while ignoring these objective tendencies and the experience of existing socialism, we would return to utopia, to utopian socialism.

That apparently is exactly what many of those who insist that we "start from zero" want to achieve.

For this reason we believe it important to determine what the philosophers and sociologists who laud utopia are aiming at. Do they merely wish to demonstrate the significance of creative imagination, supposing that utopia is the most fertile ground for this? Do they intend making the utopian approach the basic principle of social cognizance and action, replacing science with utopia? Or, lastly, do they want, without replacing scientific socialism with utopian socialism, to stress the importance of social utopia as an element of socialist culture? There are substantial differences between these three approaches.

It is one thing when the role is stressed of the "utopian moment", of "utopia" in socio-political creativity as a reminder that it is the duty of a Marxist revolutionary, at every new stage of historical development, to critically examine anew the boundaries separating the "utopian" from the "real". Such critical re-examination is really necessary because the boundaries between the "possible" and the "impossible" are historically preconditioned and, therefore, mobile. In conditions of the scientific and technological revolution, when the rate of social change increases sharply, the mobility of these boundaries also increases. However, this does not receive immediate, adequate response in the social conscousness and, therefore, it is the task of Marxist revolutionaries to discern the outlines of the future in the present and to see how, in the course of the historical process, the real possibilities, maturing in the depths of existing society, could be fulfilled. Such is the course for a Communist who constructs his ideal and strives to have it materialised, correlating the existing situation with the perspective of socio-historical development and the Marxist social ideal.

Of course, this ideal may prove impossible in certain conditions and to be a utopia *in relation to them*. For example, *immediate* socialist transformations in a country where conditions are not ripe and where there is no revolutionary situation, is utopia. However, if it means that this country's revolutionary forces should proceed in their socio-critical activities not only from a socio-political status quo and the need to fight merely for the working people's immediate demands, but also from the prospects of historical development, from the socialist ideal as the *strategic* goal of their struggle, then, in this case, there seem to be no serious grounds for theoretical controversy.

It is quite a different matter when we are asked to make utopianism the underlying principle in determining our revolutionary aims and, abstracting ourselves from social reality, take for our starting point the aim we wish to attain and then backtrack to work out the ways and means of its attainment. But history is not mathematics; "calculating" the path to our goal without consideration of concrete political and social conditions is just as dangerous as disregarding the lessons of experience.

Philosophers who sincerely expect great results from the "reutopianisation" of socialism are unwitting captives to the old delusion that breaking out of the "tight" framework of science and choosing instead arbitrary, "free" designing and practical implementation of social ideals will, in the end, produce a more perfect, freer and happier society. Such utopian ideals might, of course, look attractive, especially in the eyes of the oppressed masses. But centuries of history have shown that they are attainable only to the extent that they coincide with the real direction and results of the dialectical synthesis of social contradictions. And conversely, the nearer they come to the "absolute" ideal, and the more arbitrary the imagination that produced them, the less chance do they stand of being translated into practice. Incidentally, both Fichte and Kant were fully aware of that and considered the utopian ideal as such *unattainable on principle*. But this was of no great importance for Kant, who valued the utopian ideal primarily as a moral imperative. "Though this perfect system will never come to be," he reasoned in the *Critique of Pure Reason*, "we must nevertheless accept the idea that takes this maximum as a prototype and, guided by it, works towards all possible perfection of the rational social system."

But what is permissible for the speculative philosopher holding aloof from practice is not, in our view, permissible for the materialist philosopher who wants to devise a practical, socialist-oriented ideal, nor for the revolutionary politician who wants to bring that ideal to reality. All the more so, if they represent a political—let alone ruling—party responsible to its class, people and working people in other countries.

True, history knows of instances when utopia became an active material-practical force capable of mobilising the masses by some slogan or programme that appealed to them and determined, for some period, the policy of the class, or even the direction of the country's development. But sooner or later attempts immediately to put into practice ideals that are at odds with the objective trends of social development ended in failure, and the ideals themselves were distorted.

That is why Communist and Workers' parties have always combated utopianism within their ranks, irrespective of the forms it assumed.

As for utopian socialism as an independent ideological and political trend, its role in present-day conditions, too, is determined by the proposition enunciated by Marx and Engels in the *Communist Manifesto*: "The significance of Critical-Utopian Socialism and Communism bears an inverse relation to historical development. In proportion as the modern class struggle develops and takes definite shape, this fantastic standing apart from the contest, these fantastic attacks on it, lose all practical value and all theoretical justification."

From this follows that, in the present historical setting, utopian socialist

doctrines can play a certain positive political role only to the extent that they gain currency among a part of the non-proletarian mass, with its immature class-consciousness and because of its position (at this stage) not having risen yet to the level of scientific socialism. This applies in particular, as several Marxist researchers have pointed out, to some of less developed countries.[5] But even in these cases the role of socialist utopia can be positive only to the extent that it proves capable of subsequently leading the masses to scientific socialism.

The Marxists' critical attitude to reutopianisation of the socialist ideal, the substitution of an abstract, speculative scheme for the scientifically tested ideal, does not however, mean that social utopia has no right of existence as an integrating element of socialist culture. In the spiritual life of society utopia performs a specific cognitive function.[6] It expresses man's notion of what he and the world he lives in could be like under circumstances which cannot now be the subject of scientific investigation. Utopia performs the function of "exploring the limits of the possible" (as applied to society as a whole and its various institutions) and formulating judgment criteria. This form of cognition could be of appreciable assistance in scientific investigation of the picture of the world and in the scientific elaboration of the social ideal. However, deliberately rejecting delineation of the scientific from the utopian elements, let alone attempts to "inject" utopia into the political practice of the working class by "violating" history—can negatively affect the course of social development. Regrettably, there have been such cases. That is why appeals to reutopianise socialism, substitute utopia for science, ignore the differences between utopia and our ideals cannot, in our opinion, prove fruitful.

Scientific socialism proceeds from reality and always presupposes creative endeavour in theory and practice. Disclosing prerequisites of the new within the old, discovering possible paths of transition to the new and, lastly, visualising (on the basis of analysis of phenomena and processes) the outlines of the future society, synthesised in the social ideal—without this social revolution, let alone socialist revolution, is inconceivable. And this, in turn, is inconceivable without creative social imagination. We should dream, Lenin urged the Russian revolutionaries, but we should also know how to dream. To explain his thought, Lenin turned to the renowned 19th-century Russian literary crisis D. I. Pisarev, emphasising his idea of the benefit of a dream that runs ahead of events, but is closely linked with life.[7] "Of this kind of dreaming there is unfortunately too little in our movement. And the people most responsible for this are those who boast of their sober view, their 'closeness' to the 'concrete', the representatives of legal criticism and of illegal 'tail-ism' " (Vol. 5, p. 510).

Lenin's appeal to dream, to creative imagination, is just as pertinent today as when it was first made in the early 1900s. For socialist revolution, taken in the totality of its political and socio-economic changes, makes special demands on the subject of revolutionary action, his consciousness and culture. Lenin's appeal has a topical relevance also in capitalist society, where the ruling class sees one of its key social aims in "taming" the imagination of the working people, depriving it of its revolutionary-critical character and making it purely "reproductive", i.e., oriented on the achievement of social values and the search for ideals that would not carry the individual beyond the framework

of bourgeois civilisation. We should not, of course, exaggerate the achievements of bourgeois ideology in patterning a "one-dimensional" consciousness nor its ability to "integrate" the working class in the capitalist system. But neither should we underestimate its persistent efforts towards that goal. Marxists-Leninists are well aware that creative imagination can be an effective instrument of social-revolutionary activity only if it is inculcated in the *broadest masses of the working people*. And in application to socialist revolution, this is a law.

And so, each new generation of revolutionary Marxists is called upon, in our opinion, to accomplish two interconnected tasks: first, to analyse, using Marxist methodology, the tendencies and perspectives of the development of the existing society, revealing the new social requirements and thus taking a step forward in elaborating and concretising the socialist ideal. Second, actively to facilitate the formation of revolutionary mass consciousness capable of assimilating this ideal and using it as a guide in all social and political activity.

But what social reality should we now take as our starting point in charting the outlines of the scientifically envisioned future? For the utopian, who builds with scant thought to the roots of the edifice, this question is of no essential importance. For the Marxist-Leninist, however—and this follows from all that has been said—it is, in the final analysis, the main question, for it concerns the content and historical substantiation of the ideal.

As formulated, in its main features, by Marx and Engels, the socialist (communist) social ideal was crystallised as the result of the dialectical synthesis of the contradictions of the capitalist society of their time, the most advanced society of the 19th century. In the present historical era, however, the social reality that determines the content of the maturing socialist ideal is much more complex.

Of course, today, too, capitalism is part of social reality, which is the very basis for elaborating the socialist ideal. In what sense? First, contemporary capitalist society retains the "old" and produces new contradictions and problems. Socialism cannot be achieved without their revolutionary resolution. Critical analysis of these contradictions remains the *sine qua non* of further elaboration of the socialist ideal. Second, revolutionary forces are at work within contemporary capitalist society, and their practical experience and theoretical activity contribute to a more profound vision of the future socialist and communist society.

But in our age we cannot afford—unless we ignore the comprehensive approach, which alone can assure the further elaboration of the socialist ideal in its entirety—to disregard analysis of historical experience, the achievements of existing socialism and its problems and contradictions, and the theoretical research of Marxists-Leninists in the socialist countries. For it is precisely in these countries that the socialist ideal has acquired visible features in the form of public property of the means of production and working people's power. It is precisely in these countries that the socialist ideal was the basis for the formation of the existing socialist working class, the socialist collective-farm peasantry and the socialist intelligentsia, i.e., the forces capable of, and prepared to, develop and enrich that ideal.

Living socialism does not assert itself through spontaneous processes, but is consciously built by the popular masses under the leadership of the Com-

munist parties and on the basis of cognition and utilisation of socialism's objective development laws. Concrete struggle for our ideal removes the social barriers to scientific, technical, economic and social progress, eliminates economic crises and unemployment, national discord, opens broad vistas to the advance of science and culture, brings them within the reach of the popular masses, and provides the conditions for the all-round development of the individual.

When we speak of existing socialism as the embodiment of the social ideal, we do not equate it with the socialist ideal. First, because the socialist society of today is but the first phase of communism, a stage on the road to our goal. Besides, so that social undertaking should reach its aim, it must draw on understanding of the objective dialectics of social processes, and here a substantial role is played by the process of rational (indirect) cognition. Communists are aware that the realisation of each of the aims they set necessarily presupposes developing definite rationally cognised links. Their utilisation causes a natural chain of consequences and, simultaneously, complex problems, but the decisive question is whether this chain can help (and how) in attaining the socialist goals and consolidating the forces which are the bearers of the socialist ideal. The firmer the foundation the Communist movement acquires in the struggle for its aims, the more frequently the bourgeoisie has recourse to attacks on the means of attaining the socialist ideal. This has now become part and parcel of the strategy employed by the ideologues of the imperialist bourgeoisie in the struggle against socialist ideology. Indeed, as Hegel put it in the *Phenomenology of Mind*, their "impatience requires the impossible, namely, the attainment of the aim without turning of the means".

Lastly, as indicated above, the communist ideal itself changes and is enriched in the development process of contemporary society. In other words, its realisation (as the course of human history itself) proceeds through an ascendent process. The experience of socialist construction in one country cannot be fully elevated to the "rank of ideal", or equated with the ideal, but it is just as fallacious to contrast the socialist ideal to existing socialism, or to fail to see in the life of the socialist community the basic traits and regularities of the society whose emergence was scientifically prognosticated by the Marxist-Leninist classics.

Only an "absolutist", ivory-tower philosopher is likely to contrast the socialist ideal to what has already been achieved in translating it into practice. For such a philosopher has not the vaguest notion of how great social ideals are brought to reality here, on our earth. That contrast might be made also by the ideologist who deliberately exploits the concept of "ideal" to combat existing socialism. And this, in our view, raises still another important question.

We all know Marx's thought that even the most abstract universal categories can have real significance, but only in concrete historical conditions. That is doubly true of the socialist ideal. The concept of socialism undergoes change in the conditions of the given country, acquires a definite content, determined by the reality of that country's culture, traditions and socio-economic development. But that should not be taken to mean that such changes do away with the great richness of this concept, which reflects the essential features of the given social formation, features that distinguish it from all other social formations.

The concrete experience, life and practice of [illegible] are, so *far, our only criteria of the correctness of the theory of scientific* socialism; *history has not given us any other* opportunity *to test our ideal against* reality. Tested by revolutionary practice, scientific socialism has become a powerful weapon of the working class, of all working people, in the struggle to build the new socialist and communist society.

---

[1] See Aldous Huxley, "Brave New World", New York-London, 1932; George Orwell, "The Animal Farm", London, 1945, and "1984", London, 1949.

[2] Herbert Marcuse, "An Essay on Liberation", London, 1969, p. 86.

[3] "Socialist Humanism", Ed. by Erich Fromm, New York, 1965, p. 199.

[4] In pre-Marxist bourgeois philosophy the problem of the ideal was best elaborated by German classical philosophy, starting with Kant and Fichte and then by Hegel. In the Kant-Fichtean tradition the ideal was interpreted as being a certain static condition of perfection based on the complete abolition of social contradictions. By this approach, the ideal, a product of speculation, was attainable only in the imagination, becoming a moral imperative and, herefore, identical with utopia. Hegel understood this and proved that a social ideal formulated in this manner is but an expression of the objective helplessness of the subject. For Hegel the basis for the formation and establishment of the ideal was not in negation, not in a mythical overcoming of social contradictions, but in their dialectical synthesis. However, Hegel's speculative identification of the rational and the empirical, his faith in self-development of the spirit made it possible to comprehend the social ideal as an expression and, at the same time, an instrument of society's revolutionary transformation. Hegel was unable to form a clear picture of the real social nature of the ideal, for this required a materialistic understanding of history, something that was made possible only with the emergence of Marxism.

[5] See R. A. Ulyanovsky, *Socialism and the Liberated Countries*, Moscow, 1972, pp. 535-36.

[6] This is discussed, for instance, by the British Marxist historian A. L. Morton in his *The Matter of Britain*. Morton first put his views at an international symposium arranged by this journal. See "What Future Awaits Mankind?", Prague, 1964.

[7] "My dream," Lenin quotes Pisarev, "may run ahead of the natural march of events or may fly off at a tangent in a direction in which no natural march of events will ever proceed. In the first case my dream will not cause any harm; it may even support and augment the energy of the working men. . . . If man were completely deprived of the ability to dream in this way, if he could not from time to time run ahead and mentally conceive, in an entire and completed picture, the product to which his hands are only just beginning to lend shape, then I cannot at all imagine what stimulus there would be to induce man to undertake and complete extensive and strenuous work in the sphere of art, science, and practical endeavour. . . . If there is some connection beween dreams and life, then all is well" (Vol. 5, pp. 509-10).

[8] For instance, in our days, too, the ideologues of capitalism try to represent the revolutionary demands of the working class merely as unjustified, senseless radicalism because, as Daniel Bell, quite a notorious author, puts it in his latest work, "the real problems arise the 'day after the revolution', when the mundane world again intrudes upon consciousness" (D. Bell, *The Cultural Contradictions of Capitalism*, London, 1976, p. 29). In this case bourgeois ideologues deliberately speculate on replacing problems of one level, whose solution is sought by the masses immediately at the time of the revolution when the question of power is being decided, with problems of a different level and content, which are, of course, no less complex and difficult and which arise in the process of *building* the foundations of the new society.

The Struggle is only Beginning

MARIA ALDA NOGEIRA

Central Committee member, Portuguese Communist Party

International Women's Day, March 8, symbolises the unity and solidarity of working women throughout the world in the fight for the ideals of peace, democracy and social progress.

This article is about one contingent of the international women's movement. Many Portuguese women have given the best years of their lives to the battle against fascism and are today in the front ranks of the new Portugal's democratic forces. Some deserve to be described as heroines. That fully applies to the author of this article. When she was nominated to the Central Committee at the party's Eighth Congress in November 1976, all that had to be said of her was: "Secondary school teacher, age 52, member of the party for 35 years, alternate member of its Central Committee for 19 years, spent nine years in prison."

IN 1934, 3,000 women of Barreiru, a working-class area, demonstrated for the release of political prisoners. Unprecedented for scale and militancy, the demonstration became a landmark in the women's revolutionary movement, which continues to play an outstanding part in the struggle of our party, the working class and the people against fascism, for democracy and Portugal's advance to socialism.

Portuguese women did not lack stamina and courage in the harsh years of fascist oppression. In the Salazar and Caetano years, membership of the Communist Party, even interest in the life of the socialist countries, or protests against the colonial war, or participation in strike actions, were punishable by years behind bars.

Side by side with the men, our women prepared the revolutionary events of April 25, 1974. On the eve of the revolution, thousands of women from the textile mills, garment shops, electronic and other factories were joined by peasant women and farm labourers in a series of political demonstrations, rallies, strikes and other mass actions. The Eighth Communist Party Congress paid homage to their activity in its resolution: "The women's struggle strengthened the forces ranged against the dictatorship, regardless of whether they were fighting for better conditions, higher wages, or to mobilise public opinion against the colonial war, soaring living costs, for peace, disarmament and against fascist repression."

And now, looking back on the events after April 25, we have every right to say that without the women's active and mass participation, the revolutionary process in Portugal would have developed at a slower pace. It would have been impossible to transform, in so short a time, the country's political, economic and social life, achieve truly historic gains and unhold them against reactionary attacks, notably in September 1974 and March 1975. The political impact of the women's revolutionary-democratic movement found cogent

expression in the election of most of the left-wing deputies to the Constituent Assembly and the Assembly of the Republic. As our Party General Secretary, Alvaro Cunhal, has emphasised, the active and mass participation of women has been a major factor in carrying forward the revoutionary process after April 25.

The revolution awakened our women to political activity, gave them a bigger share in the democratic movements and mass actions to build the new Portugal. It also considerably improved their social position, particularly in industry. In the past, 82.5 per cent of all employed women were earning less than the present minimum; now their wages have been raised and they also enjoy a number of privileges.

However, these partial improvements are no substitute for solution of the overall question of women's place in society. The revolution put that question squarely before the country and it was the subject of a spirited discussion in framing the new Constitution.

The Communists have always followed a clear policy on this question, worked out by the founders of Marxism-Leninism and enriched by the experience of existing socialism. The Communists have consistently opposed discrimination and inequality and have just as consistently worked for women's social emancipation and their active part in the life of society. These views have won wide support among our people and have become the basis for joint action with other socialist-oriented parties and trends.

The efforts of Communist deputies of the Constituent Assembly, their voting together with the Socialist deputies, brought into the Constitution articles that put an end to discrimination against women and granted them equality with men. For one thing, they are entitled to equal pay for equal work, equal job opportunities and skill training. There is also full equality in the family and society.

All these anti-discrimination principles are rights set out in the Republic's Constitution are one of the biggest gains of our revolution. Moreover, the Constitution is itself an important means of intensifying the struggle of our working women, professionals and housewives to put these constitutional provisions and principles into practice. The reactionary forces and capitalist employers are, naturally, against that: now, as in the past, women workers are the first to be fired when a recession sets in.

But it also has to be acknowledged that some of the old prejudices and inadequate appreciation of factual full equality for the continued development of the revolutionary process still have to be overcome among the democratic forces too.

The Eighth Communist Party Congress was an event of historical importance. Among the many problems it discussed was the women's question and ways of resolving it.

The party's policy is clearly set out in the Congress resolutions. One of them says that as things stand today, women are still discriminated against. This restricts the people's revolutionary potential and militates against bringing additional forces into the building of the new Portugal. One of the Communist Party's basic aims is to end this unequal and unjust attitude to women, their inferior position in society and the social conditions that prevent them from applying all their abilities in industry and public life.

The Congress's decisions also emphasise the need to provide conditions that would ease the lot of working women and housewives, enabling them more systematically to share in the work of organisations upholding their rights and interests and promoting the more general aims of the Portuguese revolution.

In pursuance of these aims, the Congress drew up a number of measures (we call them "high-time measures") designed fundamentally to change the conditions of women, especially of working women, so that they could enjoy factual equality at work and in the home, have more free time, and take a more active part in political, social and economic life. This is what the Congress resolved on this question: "The interests of women must be upheld in practice through continued abolition of the still existing numerous economic and social discriminatory measures. The most pressing demand today is mother and child care, day nurseries, kindergartens, canteens, laundries, legally guaranteed maternity leave, etc. This requires joint measures by the state and public organisations."

But women's social emancipation does not end at that. We know only too well from the history of the women's movement and from the experience of the socialist countries that full emancipation is achievable only if women are given a share in social production. That alone can help overcome the difficulties, conventionalities and barriers preventing women from applying their abilities as equal members of society.

In this respect, the present socio-economic situation in Portugal is far from satisfactory. We have the lowest percentage of working women in capitalist Europe—25 per cent of the economically active population and only 18.5 per cent of the female population. It is very hard to increase these figures because of the economic crisis.

Portugal's catastrophic economic condition during the fascist dictatorship was further aggravated after April 25 by the sabotage of the big national bourgeoisie and the imperialist monopolies. There was an acute financial crisis. Production was declining, with mass lay-offs in industry and the services. And though women make up less than a quarter of the economically active population, they account for about half of all the lay-offs.

Our party attaches special importance to organising the women's movement and its political activisation. Thousands of women are displaying a keen interest in politics and a keen desire to be involved in developing the democratic aims of the revolution and in directing the country along the socialist road. But organising them is no simple matter. About 830,000 women work outside the home, and more than two million are housewives, who, as a rule, are not associated with the trade union movement or mass organisations. Naturally, this complicates political work among them. That is why the Eighth Congress urged party collectives and party members to "devote more attention to organising and mobilising women, the aim being to overcome still existing difficulties, prejudices and discrimination, which are holding back participation of working women and housewives in the social transformations at the present stage of the revolution".

Attention was drawn to another aspect of the women's question. It is no secret, of course, that discrimination and unjust attitudes in relation to women find expression in the gaping disproportion between their revolutionary activity before and after April 25 and their appointment to responsible positions. This

disproportion is being gradually eliminated, but not as fast as we would like. The task is to put more women into leading positions in industry, the trade unions, various political and public organisations.

This applies to our own party as well. There are thousands of women activists in its ranks. Many of them have been elected to local and national government bodies. Nevertheless the Congress found that the number of women appointed to responsible party functions is not in proportion to their membership in the party. For instance, though they make up 17 per cent of party membership, less than 11 per cent of nominees to the Party Central Committee were women. This is evidence, as many Congress delegates emphasised, "of serious shortcomings in our work with women cadres, especially with women engaged in industry".

We are especially anxious to bring more working women, peasants and housewives into the party. In fact, this is now our biggest source of recruitment and the number of women members is growing faster than general party membership. And yet the proportion of women in the party is still small. In various parts of the country the percentage is much higher. For instance, in Cascaite near Lisbon it is 21.6 per cent. In other words, we have not tapped all our reserves and local party organisations must display more energy in bringing women into the work of building the new society.

The women's question in Portugal, we believe, is a national issue, a component part of the battle for democracy and for new social and political gains of the revolution. Accordingly, it concerns the whole of our party and should be discussed by its members along with other national issues. Given that approach, we can take news steps towards full emancipation of women, which will assure their greater participation in the revolutionary process. The forces of revolution will grow in strength and scope if more women work shoulder to shoulder with the men in defending, developing and strengthening our young democratic republic, which has chosen the road that opens up to it socialist perspectives.

The Agricultural Policy of the EEC

EMANUELE MACALUSO
Member of the ICP Leadership

THE Statement adopted by the Conference of Communist parties of capitalist Europe (May 1975) stressed that the policy of the Common Market, instead of promoting agriculture, making it more profitable, improving the farmers' standard of life and serving as a guarantee for consumers and hence for all working people, has engendered and aggravated all the negative phenomena underlying the current crisis. First of all, it spurred inflation, especially in some European countries.

The Statement also said that although the Communist parties were operating in dissimilar conditions, "a common answer to the policy of monopoly economic integration can and must be found especially through joint action for solutions

corresponding to the interests of all the peoples of capitalist Europe and for genuinely democratic European co-operation".

The past year has seen important changes in almost all EEC countries. A new political situation is shaping under the impact of some of these changes. The most revealing fact is, of course, the decisive swing to the left in Italy, as the June 1976 elections showed. Indeed, their outcome at parliamentary and government level marked the beginning of a new political stage and this is bound to have its effect on the struggle for new paths in EEC policy. In France, the political crisis is worsening in the wake of the left gains in cantonal elections, and as for Giscard d'Estaing's home policy strategy, it has failed. The result is discord among the majority and the formation of the Barre cabinet. In Britain the Labour government is faced with serious difficulties. In West Germany it was all the coalition could do to survive the last elections.

The economic situation is still less certain. In spite of signs of an upturn, which, incidentally, varies from country to country, the basic problems—unemployment and inflation—are as acute as ever, though they manifest themselves differently in different conditions. The West German economy is inching up, at least now, whereas Britain remains, in spite of minor improvements, the "great sick man" of the capitalist economy, along with Italy. In France the rate of economic growth slowed down considerably after the sharp upswing in the autumn and winter of 1975.

In this climate of general economic instability, increasing dependence on the United States is a heavy burden on Western Europe. EEC foreign policy has lately become more contradictory than before. The cumulative effects of the economic crisis and the lack in the Nine of means to eliminate them, as well as disunity over aims have objectively made for still heavier dependence on the USA. Re-emerging US hegemony shows only too plainly that the Europe of the Common Market has no political future. This has seriously undermined EEC efforts to protect itself on monetary and financial issues by seeking direct agreement with the developing countries.

But what has yielded even more meagre results is, undoubtedly, the agrarian policy efforts of the Community's leading groups. They have rejected all plans aimed at genuine reform and emphasise the need to meet traditional corporate interests. The monopoly groups producing for export are the only ones to have emerged unscathed from the 1973-74 crisis.

A new crisis is in evidence in the dairy industry: a million cows have been slaughtered, there is a stockpile of 1.3 million tons of powdered milk, soyabeans are imported from the US without any plan whatever and in growing quantities. The EEC's ill-advised agricultural policy has disastrous social and economic consequences. They may be described as wasting and destroying farm produce, affording absurd privileges and advantages to big producers and big trading companies and making most producers uncertain of being able to sell their output at a profit. It is a policy leading to unemployment in the countryside, a crisis in peasant farming, and a high cost of living that hits consumers and taxpayers. Today it is a most serious cause of imbalances in the EEC, of increasing inflation, disruption of international markets and subservience of the European economy to US interests.

In fact, Western Europe has in recent years become more dependent on the world food market, primarily the US market. In 1975, trade with the US left the

EEC with a deficit exceeding $6,000m., of which $4,300m. was accounted for by agricultural imports. And whereas US penetration into the West European market is intensifying (soyabean exports, for instance, have increased tenfold and stand at 2.6 million tons now), a rigid system of import quotas makes it harder and harder for European products to reach overseas markets. The US does not hesitate to use its dominant position as a means of imposing its terms on the world economy.

Agricultural and food problems have acquired decisive importance. They involve both the satisfaction of food requirements and international relations generally. This is why agriculture must become the main lever in the common social and economic development strategy of Western Europe and the basis on which the Nine could play a different political role towards the developing countries, the US and the socialist world. It also explains why Western Europe cannot build its agricultural policy on the principles of a geographically restricted group.

To solve the problems of agriculture is also most important economically. The evolution and difficulties of agricultural production due to the transition from the stage of "surpluses" to food shortages throughout the world have lately told on the prices of farm products. This shows that the lack of adequate supplies and the profiteering encouraged by it have become a decisive factor for inflation. After all, unrestrained increases in the prices of agricultural staples began a year before the oil crisis.

The foregoing implies, in our view, that a thorough revision of EEC agrarian policy affecting the principles of agricultural production and the very model of its development, shaped in the sixties, brooks no delay. When the EEC conference in Stresa, Italy, was laying the groundwork for its agrarian policy, the world economic situation was entirely different from today's. An ample reserve of cheap labour, a power industry based largely on the countries' own resources (in the late fifties, this basis was still mainly coal), a very limited home market and the availability of free, investible capital, first of all US capital, dictated a development strategy giving an unqualified priority to the manufacturing industry, so that its output might be exported to developing countries in exchange for raw materials and food products. Such a strategy pushes the agricultural sector into the background, of course. At best, support is given to the strongest and most viable part of it, whose development meets the European partners' common aspirations and means bigger profits.

The present task of bringing about a change of policy arises from something more than the need to make up speedily for the damage caused by the anarchic development of the agricultural sector. It is also necessitated by an entirely different economic situation, for the deepening general crisis of capitalism, inflation and unemployment have altered the conditions and possibilities of obtaining raw materials, energy and low-interest capital. What is needed today is a different type of development changing the role of agriculture.

Agriculture is gaining in importance all over the world as demand for wheat, maize, soyabeans, meat, and other products grows. Its relationship with other economic fields is changing in the sense that growing agricultural production is becoming an essential condition for overall economic progress, specifically in industry. As a matter of fact, it is very important to build up stocks of farm produce so as both to meet the food requirements of millions in Europe and

elsewhere and bring into being a new system of political and economic relations (provided the needs of the developing countries are met), which would ultimately foster industrial progress as well.

But the nature of the economic revival in evidence in some West European and other countries suggests that under the pressure of big capital, both international and domestic, emphasis is again laid on a type of development aimed primarily at restructuring certain industries. In short, agriculture is assigned a secondary and subordinate role once again.

In the context of the Common Market's agricultural policy, this means, in effect, renouncing all reform and keeping a system which makes for increasing protectionism, still more uneven development of the EEC countries and class inequality. The desire for talks to revise the Community's agricultural policy—a desire expressed by some countries (before the autumn of 1975, anyway)—is apparently giving way to discussion of minor changes that cannot remove today's serious shortcomings, not even for a short time. The situation has deteriorated so greatly that there is no more point in speaking of a common agricultural policy. Compensational prices and monetary fluctuations have destroyed the foundations of this policy to such an extent that the leading EEC bodies hardly resist any longer measures adopted at national level, without co-ordination with other countries, and hence worsening the overall situation.

We consider that it is now possible to step up the campaign for a revision of the common agricultural policy pursued so far and that this should be done within the framework of more extensive measures designed to change the character of West European integration. This change should help to solve problems of developing agriculture on a comprehensive and balanced basis, remunerating the labour of farmers and agricultural workers and guaranteeing fair prices for consumer goods with due regard to quality and quantity. What makes it easier for the EEC to reshape its agricultural policy is that this is an objective requirement of the general economic situation, which is unstable in spite of signs of an upward trend in this or that country. This is also necessary because the consumer is unhappy about the mounting cost of living, the increased stockpile of "surpluses", frequent instances of their destruction and the growing expenditures of the European Agricultural Guidance and Guarantee Fund, and because the farmers and agricultural workers are dissatisfied, having no guarantees of earning a stable income or selling their output.

We believe joint action to force a radical revision of the Community's agricultural policy should be directed primarily against current methods of leadership. These methods, chosen under pressure from the big manufacturers and, above all, in the interest of big multinational capital, result in contradictory and absurd solutions. Therefore it is very important, in our view, to campaign for the Community adopting a principle of programming measures based on constant and public confrontation of opinions between the EEC authorities and member countries, as well as between these authorities, the European Parliament and diverse social forces. This would make it possible to coordinate at European level the major tasks which the member states would subsequently have to accomplish, specifying or amending them in line with their national conditions. It is the only way really to take account of available natural and manpower resources and use them according to local possibilities and with due regard to the evolution of the world food market. What we mean is, in effect, the necessity for

an agrarian and food programme that would lay down objectives and lines combining national regulation with EEC interests. In other words, it is necessary to establish a scale of priorities and select goals in keeping with the interests of the working people and agricultural producers of the whole of Western Europe and not with the interests of the multinationals.

Hence, we think there is a need for deep-going organisational changes in the Community, or rather new relations between the EEC and its individual members, between the Community and various social forces. It is highly important, as we see it, to set about democratising EEC institutions and legislative bodies. This would help to eliminate today's bureaucratic centralisation and evolve new methods of control and participation by parliaments and national social forces in framing and implementing EEC policy. New legislative bodies would be established in the process to allow the member states to pursue common goals through measures meeting national economic needs and taking account of national conditions. After all, economic distinctions today are greater than ever. This is a result of uneven development due, in turn, to the lopsided process of West European integration.

It is only in this way, by substantially democratising Western Europe (which would mean full control by national parliaments, producers, consumers and the working people generally), that resistance can be put up to the multinational companies and the corporate interests of the more powerful agricultural groups, which still impose various unilateral solutions on the EEC and are exempt from all national control.

A common, democratically drafted programme and a global strategy taking into account national interests are the bais on which the main development lines of the agriculture of the Nine can be determined, meaning also the specification of price and structural policy objectives and the distribution of regional funds. In the absence of a common programme, market regulation increases production anarchy to the detriment of consumers and producers alike. The policy pursued so far has meant encouraging grain and dairy farms (70 per cent of EEC funds are earmarked for this purpose). But this adds to the production potential of the most-favoured regions and most competitive farms. At the same time, farms producing Mediterranean crops (and denied all protection), as well as the less profitable grain and livestock farms are declining. This is the case in both Italy and more developed countries. Production concentration on the most viable farms has made them more efficient, but the quantity of output per capita has not been growing at an adequate rate in spite of huge appropriations. Such is the logic of stimulating productivity only on some of the farms; it has weakened the whole system of agricultural production. Besides, the Community's price mechanism has always and everywhere profited the owners of output and not those who produce it. Consequently, the task is to alter this mechanism in a way making it possible to fix prices according to the lowest cost price and meeting at the same time the requirements of farms where production entails greater outlays, through additional forms of income and differentiated stimulation of production. The aim should be to enable the weakest farms, which are capable of modernisation none the less, to effect requisite changes guaranteeing appropriate income levels. On the other hand, it should consist, in addition to price policy, in encouraging the development of unprofitable branches according to plan or the re-establishment of the balance in branches showing structural contradictions.

The need is for a policy promoting technological renewal of the agricultural, trade and industrial structures of West European countries and the removal of major obstacles of a parasitical nature, such as exist in Italy. Furthermore, by organising co-operation among the Mediterranean countries, a proper counterweight can be set up against the domination of the multinationals and the stronger groups of agricultural producers of Northern Europe, which have resorted to protectionism to safeguard their own production of certain items.

Going back to the more general problem of a new EEC agricultural policy, we must stress that the Community needs, in effect, a policy not injuring the less developed regions or weaker social strata, but establishing an equilibrium and maintaining the level achieved in the regions where production is more developed, while fostering production and consumption at a higher social level in regions now regarded as secondary.

No tangible results can be expected from a structural policy, either, unless the price-fixing mechanism is thoroughly changed. With the present trend of market policy, very few farms could make up—due to changes and improvements within their own framework—for what they lose through this policy. This does not eliminate the necessity for a new structural policy aimed at using the entire agricultural work force, developing virgin and inadequately cultivated lands, improving the infrastructure and protecting the environment. that is, a policy intended to provide in rural areas living and working conditions that would help to remove existing distinctions between urban and rural areas in incomes and in cultural and social conditions. This would make it possible, among other things, to bring young people, on whom the future of West European farming depends, to the countryside, or to induce young people to stay on the farms.

On the other hand, changes in market policy and extension of the range of structural policy will bear no fruit unless the central political issue, which links the very model of development to struggle against the big multinational companies, is settled. We mean the issue of relations between agriculture and the industries manufacturing machinery and those putting out food products.

Many of those who critically analyse EEC activity insist on counterposing price policy to structural policy. They point out that farm reconstruction, including its financial aspect, is regarded as a secondary matter and that this is one of the main causes of uneven development. While this is true, such an approach fails to put adequate emphasis on the fact that the price policy has not produced the expected results, that is, structural changes. For measures in support of the market were devised not to protect the interests of agricultural producers and promote farming but to suit the requirements of large-scale manufacturing.

Consumers and producers today pay for a system using rigid and intricate regulation measures in agriculture and leaving relations between agriculture and industry to be shaped by contractual deals. Where there is neither control, nor intervention to prevent profiteering by multinationals, all proposals for the harmonious and planned development of the Community are likely to be useless, due in particular to the virtually unlimited opportunities for monertary stratagems widely used by these companies. It is perfectly obvious that this kind of control can only be exercised at supranational level. And this calls, first of all, for a thorough reshaping of EEC agencies in the sense of really democratising them by extending the powers of the European Parliament, elected by universal

suffrage. But we believe there is also an imperative need to step up the coordinated action of the working people and all democratic forces so as to stop the veritable plunder carried on by multinationals in common with big domestic capital in the countries where they are operating. This action is needed, furthermore, to establish new forms of production and social organisation superior to those offered by capitalist development, and, on the other hand, to confirm the working people's ability to impose a development plan not expressing the interests of this or that group or category but genuine national needs and the demand for new relations between countries.

Accordingly, we consider it very important to achieve unity of diverse contingents of the left-wing and democratic forces, and united action by labour unions and peasant organisations willing to ascertain common points of view and search for effective means of achieving united action by the workers, peasants and all democrats of the country concerned on such issues as defining the national goals of a common economic policy.

It is also essential, we think, to establish the exact meaning of such a phenomenon as the penetration of multinational and domestic big capital into the agricultural and food sector. We must gain a clearer idea of the present structure of the West European food industry and the objectives and criteria it meets.

But, of course, a better understanding of the situation is not enough. The important thing is to fight for a new economic development policy encompassing all democrats and all the working people of town and countryside, for an agrarian and food policy that would be an alternative to monopoly expansion.

The old forms of parasitical mediation, like the fact that multinationals are allowed vast scope for action, are both a consequence and a cause of the weak and sometimes ineffective role of co-operative forms both in agriculture and among the consumers, as well as among independent workers who perform this or that operation in storing, processing or selling farm produce.

To bring about a policy of restructuring and developing agriculture, protecting the consumers' interests and finding an alternative to the growing domination of multinationals, it is necessary to encourage at EEC level a democratic co-operative movement in both trade and processing. This movement should be aimed at radically changing the present system, whose purpose is to facilitate penetration by multinationals and reduce the agricultural producer to the condition of a home-worker.

* * *

We consider that this new agrarian policy would fit into our struggle for the progress of detente and for peace in Europe and the world, into the struggle to impart a new content to West European integration. We are still faced with an integration process that began during the cold war and is subordinated to US policy and prompted by the big monopolies. It cannot lead to constructive relations with the developing countries. We are against this type of integration, and not integration as such.

We have now joined in a struggle against the policy of the forces controlling the EEC. We seek a new policy and the promotion of new leading forces in every sphere.

We consider it necessary and useful to establish constructive relations with the

USA [illegible] should, however, be based on equality and independence. The necessity for special relations between the EEC and the USA, which arises from the system of alliances linking them and which we accept, should be no obstacle to resolutely defending West European interests against action by multinational companies or against the US rulers' policy of pressure and interference. Nor should these relations be a hindrance to the development of constructive relations with the socialist countries of Europe, Asia and the American continent itself. We hold that our struggle should be based on refusing to revert to national autarky in any form and on programmed measures to further production and exchanges in and outside the EEC, measures safeguarding the interests of the peasants and consumers within the framework of West European and broader international co-operation. It is our view, therefore, that the central role of agriculture, the need for a European production programme and a revision of price and structural policy on new, democratic and flexible institutional principles are all key aspects of our struggle to change the current process of integrating agrarian markets as an essential component of the broader process of economic integration.

The True Face of Zionism

JOHN PITTMAN
Political Bureau member, CC CPUSA
ZAHI KARKABI
Secretary, CC CP of Israel

RECENT actions of international organisations and movements demonstrate the peoples' concern over the activities of world Zionism, which are now aggravating tensions on our planet and are more than ever furthering imperialist aims, Zionist leaders abet and largely determine the aggressive, expansionist policy of the government of Israel, and try to block detente. They carry on subversive activities against the world revolutionary movement and try to interfere in the affairs of various countries, both capitalist and socialist.

Zionism is a dangerous and complex phenomenon. This article deals with some aspects of the Zionist doctrine and attempts a political estimation of it. We also outline the history of the movement and its contemporary structure, try to show how Zionism translates itself into the policies of Israel's rulers, and point to certain manifestations of its crisis.

A Bourgeois Nationalist Doctrine

Politically and ideologically, Zionism is the extreme right wing of Jewish bourgeois nationalism, closely linked with the monopoly capital of the imperialist powers. The main postulate of political Zionism is separatism, a trend counterposing Jews in any country to non-Jews. In line with it, the Zionists propound the idea that all Jews in the world form a separate nation—an idea described by Lenin as "absolutely false and essentially reactionary".[1]

Zionist leaders and theoreticians formulate their ideology as pan-Jewish, transcending class structure, and preach class peace in capitalist society. In

competing with their non-Jewish counterparts in various countries, the Jewish bourgeoisie stressed at one time the idea of Jewish separation in order to monopolise the exploitation of Jewish wage labour. Although the integration of the Jewish bourgeoisie has advanced greatly in capitalist countries, they still use this method.

Zionist ideologues attempt to identify political Zionism with Judaism, with the various Jewish communities, and with Israel and the Israeli people. But as Israeli Communists point out, "Zionism must not be mixed up with the people of Israel or with the Jewish people",[2] since most Jews are not Zionists. The 17th Congress of the Communist Party of Israel emphasised that "... the Zionist movement was and remains one current only, and not even the dominant one, among the Jews of the world. This current expresses the class interests of the big Jewish bourgeoisie, which constitutes an inseparable part of the monopolist capital of the imperialist powers, and the interests of big Israeli capital connected with foreign capital—interests which contradict those of the great majority of Jews in the world",[3] including those living in Israel.

The leaders of the Zionist movement affirm that the rationale for its existence is to defend Jews against anti-Semitism. Ignoring its capitalist class roots, they claim that anti-Semitism is universal, eternal and incorrigible.

It is true that anti-Semitism, imbued with the racist content which imperialism superimposed on its religious form, inherited from the Middle Ages, aided the Jewish bourgeoisie in developing Zionism as a political trend and an ideology. As far as their class and political nature is concerned, however, they are kindred phenomena, born out of and sustained by bourgeois nationalism in its—though different—extremist forms. In fact, the objectives of Zionism are identical with those of anti-Semitism: both aim at isolating Jews from non-Jews, maintaining among them a "ghetto mentality". Moreover, the Zionists pin their hopes on anti-Semitism as a means of extending their "recruiting" opportunities. In fact, Zionism rose to resist the objectively progressive tendency of Jews to assimilate in the countries where they lived and struggled.

Another objective process which Zionism sought in vain to reverse was the development, at the start of the 20th century, of the revolutionary movement of the European countries' working class—in order to arrest the involvement of large numbers of Jewish workers in it. Zionism urges the working people to renounce struggle in unity with non-Jewish workers for democratic social changes, calls for the unification of Jews—exploiters and exploited alike—in "national" political parties and other organisations.

Take, for example, Zionist activity in the US labour movement. Their divisive and class collaborationist policies facilitate the exploitation of all US working people by US monopolies. This runs counter to the democratic and anti-capitalist militancy of US Jewish workers and undermines their living standards (as the majority of US Jews are wage earners). The Zionists objectively aid the ultra-right forces in isolating the Jewish people from their natural allies in the struggle against anti-Semitism and discrimination.

Certain Zionist factions attempt to disguise the real class nature of Zionist policy and ideology by means of "socialist" slogans. Israeli Communists have rebutted them by stating that "there has never been, and never can be, a socialist Zionism or a Zionist socialism".[4] History testifies that in all ideological and political battles between classes, the so-called "socialist Zionist" organisations

have sided with imperialism and opposed both socialism and national liberation movements. Present-day Zionism as a whole is characterised by outspoken anti-communism and anti-Soviet hysteria.

Intransingent hostility to existing and developing socialism as a reality, and recurrent campaigns against socialist countries, especially against the Soviet Union, have become a pillar of world Zionism. The Jewish big bourgeoisie stints no resources in waging a psychological war against the socialist community and the world Communist and workers' movement. The Zionists would like to plant their agents in the movement, substitute nationalism for proletarian internationalism, encourage revisionism inside the movement and rob it of its revolutionary class content on the plea of "regenerating" Marxism. Zionist organisations render imperialism the most important service in its struggle against communism through smear campaigns and other subversive actions against the Soviet Union under the false pretext of defending the rights of Soviet Jews. These actions are co-ordinated with the propaganda centres of Washington.

CPI documents stress that Zionism is being manipulated as a weapon of imperialism in its global struggle, in its ideological and political subversion against the Soviet Union and the world socialist system as a whole.[5] Undermining the unity of the forces of socialism and progress, and splitting the world revolutionary movement are the objectives that unite the imperialists and Zionists. Therefore the working class, led by Communist parties, has always rejected Zionism and rejects it today.

The Origin of the Zionist Organisation

Zionism emerged as an organised movement at the turn of the century, when capitalism entered its monopoly stage. It was the advancing capitalist era that brought conditions favourable to Zionism. The advent of imperialism was precipitated by the rapid concentration of monopolies, and by the monopolies' rush to form cartels and grab colonies overseas, by the intensification of national and racial oppression, and by reaction everywhere. Imperialism, using national chauvinism and racism as an instrument of division and oppression of the working people, was the progenitor of both anti-Semitism and political Zionism in their present-day form.

Zionism as a political trend organised itself at its First World Congress (Basel, Auguest 1897).[6] The congress announced the formation of the World Zionist Organisation (WZO), defining its main purpose as the establishment of a Jewish state in Palestine, "ingathering" all Jews dispersed all over the world. Some big Jewish capitalists financed Zionist schemes. They also had the active support of non-Jewish monopoly capital and imperialism. From the movement's inception, the Zionists sought assistance from the leading circles of counter-revolution and imperialism. For instance, Herzl himself visited and tried to make deals with the German Kaiser Wilhelm II in 1898, with the Turkish Sultan Abdul Hamid in 1901, and with Pleve, the tsarist minister and organiser of pogroms, in 1903. Later, Zionist leaders established contacts with Pilsudski in Poland, Mussolini in Italy, Antonescu in Rumania. In exhange for permission for Zionist officials and rich pro-Zionists to go to Palestine, during the Second World War certain Zionist leaders co-operated with the Nazis at the time when they were annihilating Jews throughout Europe.[7]

Up to the forties, the ruling circles of Britain were the Zionists' mainstay.[8] The

collaboration of British imperialism and world Zionism from 1917 up to 1948, which began with the Balfour Declaration,[9] was a long succession of crimes against the Arab population of Palestine. The colonisers skilfully fomented antagonisms and provoked clashes between Arabs and Jews. Armed Zionist groups operated against the Arab population under British supervision and stepped up their terror from year to year to sabotage the Arab national-liberation movement.

In 1947, the UN General Assembly passed a resolution revoking the British mandate on Palestine and dividing the region into two independent states: Arab and Jewish. Zionist leaders nominally bowed to the UN decision but worked to carve a bigger Jewish state, while still hoping to turn the whole of Palestine into a purely Jewish state. They prevented the establishment of a Palestinian Arab State, seized the greater part of the territory assigned to it and helped drive the overwhelming majority of the Arab inhabiting the area off their lands.[10] The State of Israel was founded on May 15, 1948, and its rulers made the Zionist doctrine their official ideology. They had already secured the support of US imperialism, which was challenging British and French imperialism and pushing its cold war programme against socialism and the national-liberation movement. David Ben-Gurion, the first Prime Minister of Israel, assured US Secretary of State John F. Dulles of his readiness to help US imperialism defend the "free world" against "international communism".[11] As a result, a "special relationship" developed between the Zionist rulers of Israel and the ruling circles of the United States that continues to this day. This convergence of the aims of Zionism and international imperialism, especially US imperialism, has been and still is the decisive factor in the development of the Zionist movement.

World Zionist Network

The leading Zionist bodies today comprise the World Zionist Organisation, the Jewish Agency which directs WZO activities and the World Jewish Congress.[12]

The Jewish Agency holds a pre-eminent position among World Zionist organisations. It has become an instrument of the State of Israel since its establishment. Its organs, now integrated with the state, control three-quarters of all the farmland leased out in Israel, dozens of enterprises, including land development, water supply, shipping and construction firms, as well as the El Al Airlines. It controls Radio Voice of Zion, and its functionaries hold posts in Israeli embassies and other missions abroad.

World Zionism's important bases of financial support are located in a number of capitalist countries with sizable Jewish populations—the USA (5,800,000), France (550,000), Argentina (475,000), Britain (450,000), Canada (308,000), Brazil (155,000), South Africa (120,000). Of course, Zionism considers present-day Israel as its material base. Unquestionably, the Zionist base in the USA, which provides two-thirds of the Jewish Agency's budget, is the mainstay of both world Zionism and the Zionist ruling circles of the State of Israel.

Besides the avowedly Zionist organisations, which claim a membership of about one million, i.e., a minority among the Jewish committees, there are professedly non-Zionist Jewish organisations in the USA with a considerably large membership, whose leaders have a Zionist orientation and who are as active in support of Israel's Zionist policies as the explicitly Zionist affiliates. Hundreds

[illegible] millions of dollars are annually contributed to Zionist causes by organisations such as the Women's Zionist Organisation of America (Hadassah), the Jewish National Fund, the National Committee for Labour Israel, the American Jewish Congress, B'nai B'rith and the Religious Zionists of America. The movement has infiltrated the mass media, trade union and labour groups, youth organisations, inter-religious associations, including Catholics and Protestants. It has formed a semi-fascist assault force (the so-called "Jewish Defence League"). But all this has been possible because the US ruling circles subordinate Zionism to their imperialist strategy, both global and regional. Obviously, the influence of the Zionist political lobby is reflected in the pro-Zionist positions formulated in the platforms of both parties of monopoly capital, the Republicans and Democrats. But at the same time, Zionist influence is ultimately conditional on the interests of US monopoly capital.

Zionism's global network is the main source of regular financing of Israel from the Jewish communities in the world among whom big Jewish capitalists contribute the bulk. It is estimated that from 1948 up to 1974 various Jewish "philanthropic" organisations, mainly those in the USA, contributed more than $5,000 million (although an estimated 800,000 US Jews live below the poverty line). The network serves moreover, through the Israel Economic Corporation and similar agencies, as a conduit for channelling investments funds from both Jewish and non-Jewish capitalist monopolies to Israel. The State of Israel Bonds, set up in 1951, is another source of funds, said to have brought the Israeli Zionists more than $2,500 million from the USA alone.[13]

The "special relationship" between the ruling circles of the United States and Israel expresses itself in continuous and lavish economic and especially military assistance to Israel from the US government. Grants and credits in the form of aid from the US government between 1948 and the early seventies exceeded $1,000 million. Military assistance in the 1970-75 period alone amounted to almost $3,700 million. For the period between July 1, 1975, and October 1, 1977, the US government has allocated Israel as much as $4,400 million, including about $3,000 million for military purposes. The allocation for the 1976 fiscal year alone amounts to $2,300 million (40 per cent of the US foreign aid budget). Out of this amount, $1,500 million (half of which is a grant) would be spent on arms. Besides, the Ford Administration in October 1976 decided to supply Israel with weapons that even the US armed forces are not fully equipped with as yet.

Class Reality of Israel

The godchildren of imperialism, Zionism and the State of Israel (because of its Zionist leadership) have from the outset played an ultra-reactionary role in each particular country and in international relations. Israeli reality itself is the strongest accusation against the racist, nationalist doctrine of Zionism. The Israeli rulers' attempts to represent Israel as a state brought into existence by the Jewish national-liberation movement have been exposed.

What has asserted itself in Israel is a bourgeois, pseudo-theocratic and racist regime. Zionism, pressuring Judaism into its service, sanctifies the rule of the Jewish big bourgeoisie over all the other classes of Israeli society. Life in this society is pervaded by religious intolerance, and civil freedoms are curbed. Communal and national discrimination has assumed extreme forms and in its first form (communal) is directed against Jews whom the ruling circles of

European and American origins consider lower (Jews of Asian or African origin).

The plight of the Arabs living in Israel[14] is particularly sad. They are regarded by the Zionist ruling circles as a group of religious communities. The government refuses them the status of a national minority with national rights. Discrimination, national oppression and incredibly harsh social and material conditions are intended to drive the Israeli Arabs from their homeland.[15] Taking these conditions into account, the 30th General Assembly of the United Nations on November 10, 1975, characterised Zionist ideology and practice as racism and racist discrimination.

The outspokenly racist policy of the Zionist rulers of Israel is a class policy. Zionist propaganda in Israel, as everywhere in the capitalist countries, repeats time and again that all Jews—workers and capitalists alike—are "brothers". It tries to talk the Jewish working people into recognising the interests of the bourgeoisie as their interests.

Yet the state invariably sides with the employers against the workers. Strikes are banned by law in many industries. The police are used against strikers and demonstrators. Zionist leaders do their utmost to prevent a militant unity of Jewish and Arab workers in the country. The chauvinistic and reactionary ideology of Zionism provides fertile ground for the rise of fascist groups in Israel.

Therefore, the CPI stresses that the struggle against Zionism, too, is a class struggle. At the same time, as Meir Vilner, General Secretary of the CC CPI, wrote, the Party rebuffs all who try 'to describe the struggle against Zionism as a fight against the Israeli people or Jews generally and therefore stigmatise it as 'anti-Semitic' ".[16] The CPI is convinced that the Zionist policy is detrimental to the Israeli nation developing in Israel.

The colonising activity of Israel's ruling circles in the Arab territories seized by them in the war of June 1967.[17] and their effort to implement Zionist plans for the establishment of a "Bigger Israel" are proof of Zionism's expansionist character. War, occupation and a militarised economy have strengthened the positions of the Israeli big bourgeoisie to an unprecedented extent.

The Israeli ruling circles have faithfully helped imperialism and continue to help it against the national-liberation movement. This is seen particularly in the Middle East, where they have committed acts of aggression more than once in an attempt to reverse the revolutionary achievements of the Arab national-liberation movement so as to preserve imperialism's positions in the area. The continuing Israeli occupation is a serious means of imperialist pressure on the Arab countries.

The unity of action of imperialism and the Zionist rulers of Israel is not confined to the Middle East, of course. Israel has been assigned a significant role in implementing imperialism's neocolonialist schemes in certain other areas. An example of this was imperialist propaganda's advertising Israel's "disinterested aid" to certain African countries, financed expressly by international monopolies. New states were urged in the sixties to draw on the Israeli experience of "building socialism".

However, few people in the new independent states still believe that Israel is building socialism: Histadrut[18], with its economic arms comprising factories and building industries, has become in part a capitalist enterprise harshly exploiting wage labour. The kibbutzim, originally agricultural co-operatives, are being

[illegible] where a substantial section of their economy is capitalist-oriented.

The world is also aware that the government of Israel, which advocates Zionist loctrines, is one of the few governments of the world whose official policy is rankly geared to territorial expansion. The Israeli government's support of irtually every imperialist or neocolonialist venture, especially as embodied by he US aggression in Vietnam and other countries of Indochina, has earned it an inenviable reputation. Not long ago, the Zionist rulers of Israel established a lisgraceful alliance with the racist regime of South Africa, which they now upply with arms and military experts to help it in its fight against the national-iberation movement of South Africa's peoples.

Lastly, the attitude of Israel's UN representatives—their opposition to any roposal aimed at easing tensions and furthering detente, curbing the arms race nd implementing resolutions on national independence and human ights—gives a clear idea of the true nature of Zionism. The manifestly pro-nperialist character of this Zionist practice prompts the majority of mankind to ondemn Zionism and induces people to combat it. Governed by Zionists, Israel inds itself in growing international isolation.

The Deepening Crisis

Zionist ideology and practice, which run counter to the interests of the peoples f the world, particularly the people of Israel and the majority of Jews, were ound to create difficulties and bring on a crisis of the movement in the USA and ther capitalist countries, as well as in Israel itself.

The leaders of world Zionism are deeply concerned about the fact that their laim to speak for all Jews is growing very thin. Campaigns launched in capitalist ountries to bring Jews into Zionist organisations on an individual basis produce icreasingly disappointing results.

The Jewish communities' declining interest in Israel is an obvious sign of the risis of Zionism. This decline is particularly marked among the Jewish youth. 'he majority of Jews realise that the aggressive policy of the Zionist leaders of srael is making that state the most insecure place for the Jewish people. This olicy has already caused four wars with thousands of victims. It may bring on a fth war, more devastating and with more victims. There is no doubt that this ircumstance, in addition to rejection of the Zionist doctrine, is one of the nportant reasons for the visible decline in Jewish immigration to Israel egistered of late, as well as the growing number of those who emigrate from the promised land".[19]

Attempts to identify anti-Zionism with anti-Semitism miscarry too. Even in nperialist countries, fewer and fewer people are misled nowadays by false harges of anti-Semitism when it is a question of making a critical assessment of ionist activities, condemning the aggressive nature of Iraeli policy and backing ie just struggle of the Arab peoples, primarily the Arab people of Palestine. lso, there is growing realisation of the fact that the Zionists try to divert Jews om the struggle against the true source of anti-Semitism—reactionary ionopoly capital—by falsely laying the blame for "anti-Semitism" at the door of ft-wing forces (as, for instance, in the USA). In this connection, the 21st lational Convention of the CPUSA (1975) pointed out that Jews in this country are subjected to discrimination in employment, housing, education, access to ecreational facilities and other aspects of life. Synagogues and other Jewish

[illegible] Jewish people [illegible] among the chief targets of the [illegible] the fascist ultra Right". In pointing this out, the C[illegible] for mass offensive against anti-Semitism, an offensive directed [illegible] roots".[20]

Zionism as expressed by the Israeli ruling [illegible] not help the Jews in capitalist countries, as propounded by its ideologists. Moreover, Nathan Rotenstreich, professor of philosophy at the Hebrew University of Jerusalem notes that the State of Israel has not only failed to solve the problem of anti-Semitism but "deepened and reinforced the problem by arousing anger against what the Jews have done".[21]

More and more people the world over want to take sober stock of the activities of world and Israeli Zionism. Many of them come to conclusions running counter to Zionist slogans, dogmas and theories. At the same time and as an objective historical process, the rate of assimilation of Jews in various countries is accelerating—a trend seen by Zionists as the "evil of evils".

A further sign of Zionism's crisis is that progressive and revolutionary ideas are spreading among the Jewish youth in Western Europe and America and that many of them are taking an active part in democratic struggles in their countries and in actions against Zionist practice, especially in connection with the situation in the Middle East and the national rights of the Arab people of Palestine.

In Israel itself there is growing resistance among the working people to the ruling circles' home and foreign policy. Progressive opinion takes a stand against curbs on democratic freedoms, against legislation banning strikes and against the activity of reactionary and fascist groups. The Zionist idea of class peace and co-operation is miscarrying. The Zionist policy of expansion by occupying more Arab territories has also reached the point of deep crisis.

The Communist Party of Israel is in the forefront of the country's growing anti-Zionist movement. Its programme of struggle for a peaceable settlement of the Middle East crisis, for Jewish-Arab friendship, and for measures to promote the material well-being and security of the Israeli people is steadily gaining adherents.

In line with the appeal of their 1969 Meeting,[22] the Communist and Workers' parties of the world fight without compromise against Zionism and anti-Semitism, against racial and national discrimination in any form. Their unity of action is a powerful barrier to the spread of the imperialist, man-hating doctrine of Zionism.

* * *

The real and manifold difficulties that Zionism is experiencing do not mean that it is surrendering to its fate. Indeed, its leaders try and will go on trying to step up their sinister activities. To neutralise Zionism as far as possible, it is indispensable to fight it unrelentingly on all fronts—ideological, political, economic and diplomatic. The fight against Zionism is inseparable from the fight for the vital interests of progressive mankind, for lasting world peace and international security. It is also a fight for the class interests of the international proletariat, for semocracy and socialism.

---

[1] V. I. Lenin, *Coll. Works*. Vol. 7, p. 99.
[2] Sixteen CPI Congress. Haifa, Al Ittihad Publishers, 1970, p. 561 (in Arabic).
[3] *Information Bulletin*. Communist Party of Israel, Special Issue, 1972, pp. 143-144.

continued overleaf

...resolutions of the 16th CPI Congress.
...spiritual father of Zionism was Theodor Herzl, who worked out the fundamentals ... ideology (they are set out in his book, *The Jewish State*, published in 1896).
...resolutions of the 16th CPI Congress. See also Hyman Lumer, *Zionism: Its Role in ...*, New York, International Publishers, 1973. The trial of the Hungarian Zionist leaders ... in Israel proved that these leaders had co-operated with Eichmann, the Nazi hangman.
...aim Weizmann, Zionist leader and first president of Israel, obtained British imperialist ... by promising to guard the Suez Canal for British interests.
...e Declaration, issued by British Foreign Minister Balfour in November 1917 with the previous ...val of US President Wilson, committed Britain to establish a "national home" for Jews in ...ine.
The number of Palestine refugees was close to 900,000 as early as 1948.
Michael Bar-Zohar, *Ben Gurion: The Armed Prophet*. Prentice Hall, New York, 1968, pp. 241-... cited in Lumer, op. cit., p. 38.
Every four years the WZO's highest authority, the World Zionist Congress, elects its General ...ncil and Executive Committee. The Council represents the Zionist parties and organisations ...ating in capitalist countries where there are Jewish communities. The EC has headquarters in ... York and Jerusalem. It is made up of twelve sections, each responsible for a specific kind of ...O activity; their functions range from "religious cultural" education to the organisation of ...ersion against world revolutionary forces.
...e Jewish Agency's 40-member Board of Directors has an equal number of members of the WZO ...ewish fund-collecting organisations abroad, and is guided by a 14-member group usually hand-...ed by leading Jewish capitalists.
...e WZO encompasses over 20 international associations, with branches in countries having ...sh communities, a dozen regional organisations—in Latin America, Australia, New Zealand, ...th Africa—and territorial organisations in more than 40 countries. The Jewish Agency has ...nches of its own.
...n 1936 the Zionists set up another world organisation, the World Jewish Congress (WJC), to ...act Jews opposed to or unwilling to subscribe to political Zionism. Originally the WJC ...ticised" Zionist concepts, which, incidentally, did not prevent its leader, Nahum Goldmann, from ...ng president of both the WJC and the WZO for a long time. But the Zionist character of the WJC ...s gradually made evident by its initiation of rabid anti-Soviet campaigns of slander and ...fication.
[13] Eighty per cent of Israel's enormous foreign debt, estimated at nearly $9,000 million at the end of ...76, is owed to the US government and US organisations and institutions. (See Lumer, op. cit., pp. ...-83, and *WMR*, July 1971, February 1974 and June 1975.)
[14] They make up 13.2 per cent of the population.
[15] In this connection, the Theses for the 18th Congress of the Communist Party of Israel state: "The ...icial Zionist declarations that, because of the 'Zionist character' of the state, the Arab population ...nnot enjoy equal rights and that it has to be evicted from its lands in favour of Zionist colonising ...d the 'Judaisation of the country', are intolerable and only prove the racist character of these ...onist assumptions" *Information Bulletin*, CPI, No. 9-10, 1976, p. 89).
For details on the condition of Israel's Arabs, see Salim El-Qassem, "Discrimination, a Bankrupt ...licy", in: *WMR*, October 1976.
[16] Meir Vilner, "The Struggle Against Zionism Is a Class Struggle", in: *WMR*, January 1976.
[17] In December 1976, these activities were condemned in several resolutions adopted by the 31st ...sion of the UN General Assembly.
[18] Histadrut (General Federation of Labour) was founded in 1920 and has over one million ...mbers. It is controlled by the ruling Labour Party of Israel.
[19] In 1975 the proportion of new immigrants declined virtually to that of Jews who left Israel.
[20] Main Political Resolution, 21st National Convention, CPUSA, 1975. New Outlook Publishers, ...w York, 1976, pp. 79-80.
[21] *Dispersion and Unity*, No. 21/22, Jerusalem, 1973/74, pp. 45-46.
[22] See *International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties, Moscow 1969*. Prague, Peace ...d Socialism Publishers, 1969, p. 35.

On a Pendulum Swung by Crisis

On the correspondence and discussion between WILLY BRANDT, OLAF PALME and BRUNO KREISKY, "Willy Brandt, Bruno Kreisky Olaf Palme, Briefe and Gespräche 1972 bis 1975", EVA. Frankfurt-Köln 1975.

WILLY Brandt, Bruno Kreisky and Olaf Palme exchanged ten letters between 1972 and 1975 and met for talks once in Schlangenbad and once in Vienna. What are the main Social-Democratic values today? How can the deepening of the capitalist crisis be stopped? How is it possible to "salvage capitalism", asks Olaf Palme. We believe these are the main topics dealt with by the authors of the letters included in the book.

Why an In-Depth Discussion?

Among thoughtful readers this book will inevitably evoke the question: why the need of holding a fresh, or, as Willy Brandt put it, "an in-depth discussion o the basic values of democratic socialism" (p. 11)? The answer is to be found in th book itself. The discussion among Brandt, Palme and Kreisky mirrors th mounting Social-Democratic spiritual and political crisis that is directl dependent upon the crisis of the entire capitalist system.

Many European countries, and the broad working masses that are unde Social-Democratic influence, are worried by the worsening capitalist ailments In several European countries it is the Social-Democratic governments th are responsible for the existing situation, or have been responsible for year Their wages policy, freezing of wages, failure to carry out promised reforms, c the one hand, and billions in subsidies and tax exemptions for the big concern on the other, have caused sharp criticism by workers of the Social-Democra policy and ideology and a search is in progress for an alternative. It is indicati that large segments of Social-Democratic workers in many countries a rejecting anti-Communist ideology and, together with their class allies, t Communists, are fighting against shifting the burden of the crisis onto t working people, and for political and social changes.

There are many signs of this in the FRG: the criticism of rightist positions the SDP, trade union actions against the wages policy of the government head by Social-Democrats, the heated discussion among young Socialists of sta monopoly capitalism, control of investments and distribution, and Soci Democratic policy and ideology in general. Even more indicative are the jo actions by Social-Democratic workers and Communists against the grad wage reduction, factory shut-downs, growing rents and the job ban agai progressives known as "Berufsverboton". True, these are but the first st towards joint action. But it is important that they were taken despite the a Communist decision of the SDP Board outlawing any joint action by Soc Democratic workers and the Communists.

And, finally, there has been sharp discord and a widening gap betw positions in the Socialist International on such crucial issues as united actior

...the possibility of an alliance or government coalition with the ...munists, the stand in relation to the Berufsverboten in the FRG, ...erence in the internal affairs of other countries, Italy and Portugal, for ...mple, by the SDP leadership.

Faced with the capitalist crisis and the sharpening contradictions among ...cial-Democrats, on the one hand, and the achievements of existing socialism, ...guarantees of the right to work and to a dwelling, its equal opportunities in ...ucation and medicare, its concern for children and the youth and opportunities ...r the all-round development of the individual, on the other, Brandt, Palme and ...reisky have attempted in their correspondence to galvanise Social-Democratic ...eas.

Unattainable "Basic Values of Democratic Socialism"

Referring to the SDP's Godesberg programme, Willy Brandt writes: "(In that ...ogramme) we said that the Social-Democrats . . . are striving to create a society ... which every individual would be free to develop his personality and, while ...rving this society as its member, would assume the responsibility of taking part ... mankind's political, economic and cultural affairs" (p. 12).

It seems apparent that, as distinct from Communists, Social-Democrats have ...ver created such a society. How can one accept Brandt's postulation of a free ...elopment of the individual while there are 15 million unemployed, millions of ...t-time workers and great numbers of young people denied a profession in ...italist countries?

"The plague has been overcome," Brandt seems to be consoling his ...respondents, "hunger has been banished from many countries . . . capitalism ... been tamed. . . ." (p. 39). No great consolation in the face of the facts. ...ndt's claim that "capitalism has been tamed . . ." does not ally with Kreisky's ...laration that "In Western Europe . . . there are approximately 25 large ...cerns that make up the select club of multinational societies" (p. 30), and that ... murderous competitive struggle is accelerating the process of concentration ...ing millions of unemployed into capitalism's "social outcasts".

...qually unconvincing as the words "the plague has been overcome", is what ...e says further in the book: "It is perfectly clear", he laments, "that today the ...talist system is experiencing a crisis, that the numerous basic values of ...talist society are being questioned. Many are rejecting capitalist morals and ...ology alike. Many are apprehensive and fearful" (p. 118).

...ut the anti-Marxist prejudices of Brandt as an ideologue, seem to defeat his ...lism as a politician. "If I understand correctly," we read in his correspondence, ...e proceed . . . on the assumption that modern Social-Democratic thinking ...ects illusions that with the aid of a general and schematic change in property ...ations, a decisive breakthrough is possible, while abolishing private ownership ...the means of production would automatically bring people greater freedom" ... 68).

The bankruptcy of the "basic values of democratic socialism" conception lies ...ecisely in negation by its ideologues of Marx's theory of the necessity of turning ...rge private means of production into public property. This is its main flaw. By ...andoning one of the basic Marxist tenets, the Social-Democratic leaders are ...rgely responsible for the inhuman conditions suffered by millions of working ...ople in capitalist countries and their constant fear of the morrow.

What has been happening in recent years in the economies of the developed

capitalist countries proves the validity of the Marxist proposition that whil private ownership of the means of production exists, together with the race fo maximum profits, capitalist economy will develop only in cycles. It is equall true, that any serious considerations of "economic order" (Brandt constantl refers to it) must not fail to take account of the might wielded by moder capitalist banks and the need to nationalise them, "Because", writes *Der Spiege* "they are industry's greatest overseers and are in control of 70 per cent of th capital of German joint-stock companies. They manage almost all the ke branches of industry between the Rheine and the Elbe . . . and all of them ar financiers and owners of manufacturing firms and, at the same time speculators". Meanwhile, in its tentative general programme, the SDP has this t say about the capitalist banking system: "The problems there are resolvabl without nationalisation."[1]

Brandt, Kreisky and Palme, in their correspondence are unable to break out o the vicious circle of the insoluble contradictions between the "basic values o democratic socialism, which they advocate, acknowledgment of the numerou manifestations of capitalism's "asocialness" and the futile search for the means o salvation.

Conceding these contradictions to a point, they lead their "in-deptl discussions of the basic values of democratic socialism" astray by presentin Marx and Engels as utopians, Lenin as a Jacobin and existing socialism, whicl regularly demonstrates its social vitality, as dogmatic and hardened bureaucrac (pp. 36, 37). In actual fact, however, it is the Social-Democratic leaders who hav always been utopian, divorcing the ideas of freedom and justice from the materia base and the real relationships of government and even disputing any tie between them.

From Growing into Socialism to Healing Capitalism

It will be recalled that classical reformism declared that its goal was to grov into socialism through reforms, and a careful reader is bound to notice that in their interpretation of reformism Brandt, Palme and Kreisky do not see eye to eye. Palme sees chances for reformism in reviving Social-Democratic policy, while Brandt shuns all mention of reformism. For him "democratic socialism is not a 'state' . . . it is rather a contradictory process" (p. 67).

"I am speaking mainly of internal reforms," says Brandt, explaining the process, "which, if they 'improve the system' sufficiently, could lead to advantageous changes in the social and economic order" (p. 68). However, the Social-Democrat's term in office has shown how remote their policy is from the goals proclaimed at one time by classical reformism. Even Brandt's all to modest plan for "advantageous changes in the economic order" remaine unfulfilled and as the 1973-76 crisis set in the plan gave way to attempts a regulating crisis.

As for the views Kreisky brings forth in the correspondence, he believes tha reformism is in a blind alley and that today the Social Democrats should follo Fritz Tarnow's advice and "be doctors at the bedside of ailing capitalism" (p 121). Kreisky, however, recommends that for capitalist society to "get well" th state acquire an excessive financial debt.

And where is the money to come from to pay the debt? "If we continu increasing our social policy today'," Kreisky replies, "then, possibly, we will n

[illegible] to finance [illegible] at all. We must find the courage to declare that no new social policy exists, ..." (p. 123). In plain language this means the working people will have to tighten their belts.

The policy of the FRG's Social-Democratic government shows what all this means in reality. Its backbone is to be a significant tax reform which, as the Social-Democrats claim, should help to carry out the "constitutional behest for creating a state of social law". The result is, however, that as of January 1, 1977, the added-value tax increased from 11 to 13 per cent, the food tax went from 5.5 to 6.5 per cent. But the rich stay rich, for, as the share of income tax returns continues increasing (from 12.1 per cent in 1950 to 27.4 per cent in 1973), corporate taxes over the same period dropped from 23.3 to 16.7 per cent.

So, on the whole, Social democratic "management of the crisis" means cutting down the working people's social gains thus exposing the truth behind Social Democratic talk of "quality of life" and such slogans as "the goal of Social-Democratic policy is Man". The real goal appears to be salvation of capitalism. The West Berlin paper *Extradienst* made the comment that the Social-Democrats "are afraid of losing the economic, social and socio-political competition with the other, socialist, social system".[2]

Freedom—Words and Reality

In the course of their correspondence, so full of assurances of their staunch support of freedom and democracy, Brandt, Kreisky and Palme extol society's "democratic structures", particularly the "guarantees of freedom of the individual". Could it be that the frequent references to these themes are evoked by the deep social contradictions characteristic of those Western European countries where the Social-Democrats are in office, especially in the FRG?

In a government statement in September 1969 Brandt exclaimed: "We have not reached the end of our democracy, we are just really beginning".[3]

However, today, just as yesterday, the capitalists hold unrestricted sway over their enterprises and enforce a wide variety of fines and penalties ranging from dismissals to black lists that are circulated through employers' associations. Working peoples' rights set down in the FRG Constitution are violated daily. The trade unions have been almost reduced to nil and they have surrendered to big capital and the CDU/CSU.

All attempts to win even the slightest improvement by parity management, in the name of Brandt's "big" democracy, have failed. The "Dare big democracy" slogan was, in fact, replaced with the "Increase domestic security" slogan. The German Communist Party is banned contrary to the Constitution and neither Brandt nor the Schmidt government have taken any steps to abolish this disgraceful act of the cold war days. Various subterfuges are used to hide the simple fact that this ban is aimed mainly against the workers' movement and, in the final analysis, against the sovereignty of the people.

The road to "big democracy", it seems, is paved with 800 thousand official checks on individuals and two thousand "Berufsverboten" cases. Even in the lands where the Social-Democrats are in office there have been hundreds of cases of persons being refused government jobs on political grounds, and these are not necessarily persons active in the Communist Party. For example, in North Rhine-Westphalia, a Social-Democratic territory, it is enough to attend Marxist evening courses to feel the effects of "Berufsverboten".

What, then, remains of Brandt's claim in his letter to Kreisky and Palme that he takes account of the lessons of the Weimar Republic and that he believes that "free discussion is the best way of finding just what is good for man" (p. 16)?

In the face of the worsening crisis of capitalism the Social-Democrats are not capable of guaranteeing the working people even bourgeois-democratic rights and freedoms.

So, summing up, it is apparent that all the talk by Brandt, Kreisky and Palme about the "basic values of democratic socialism" does not measure up to the test, that the Social-Democratic leaders are trying, as before, to ignore the natural laws of historical development, that their conceptions resemble a political pendulum swung wide by the crisis development of capitalist society.

So, the Social-Democratic attempts to overcome the spiritual and political crisis as "doctors at the bedside of ailing capitalism" are historically bankrupt.

Nevertheless, publication of the Brandt-Kreisky-Palme correspondence is highly instructive, particularly against the background of the recent elections in the FRG and the exit of the Palme government. It is a sure sign that the majority of Social-Democrat influenced working people are starting to move away from its leaders.

It is obvious from past and present experience that there can be no general social progress unless the power of big capital is abolished, that working class unity is a guarantee of the success of the struggle for the working people's vital rights. It is equally true that the pressing problems facing the working people in crisis-shaken capitalist countries cannot be settled without the Communists or by opposing them.

The Communists repeatedly appeal to the Social-Democratic leadership to shed their anti-Communist prejudices and join the common struggle. The Document of the Conference of European Communist and Workers' Parties not only insists on the need for united action by all working class contingents, it is also a reflection of the experience of the joint struggle of Communists and Social-Democrats for the peoples' vital interests.

Richard Kumpf

---

[1] "Der SPD OR 85", VMB Frankfurt am Main. p. 84.
[2] Stimme der DDR, Jan. 8, 1976 Sendereihe "Wissenschaftliche Weltanschauung".
[3] K.Schacht Bilanz Sozialdemokratischer Reformpolitik, VMB 1976, 39 pp.

Chronicle of a Great Revolution

The Party and the Great October. A historiographic essay by a group of authoi under I. F. Petrov, Moscow, Politizdat, 1976, 294 pp.

THE events of the Great October Socialist Revolution that ushered in a new e in world history, and its enduring lessons, are of undying interest to researc workers. This is particularly true this year, the 60th anniversary of the revolutio Our ideological opponents are also preparing for this date, true, in their ov way.

The historiography of the Great October Revolution, the authors wri remains the object of a fierce ideological struggle (p. 3). The interest shown

bourgeois ideologists in the history of our revolution is prompted by the class
nterests of the imperialist bourgeoisie who fear the mounting influence of the
evolution's liberatory ideas. The need to oppose the revolutionary movement
xplains the bourgeois distortions of the role of Lenin's Party in the October
Revolution.

There is hardly any need to speak about the importance attached to the intense
esearch of this subject in the USSR over the past 60 years. Soviet historians have
vritten a good deal about the October Revolution and the role played by the
'arty in preparing and carrying it out. The book traces the accumulation of
locumentary and conceptual material on the subject, how research expanded,
nd the problems that researchers are dealing with today. Skillfully analysing the
eneralising works on the Communist Party—the inspirer and organiser of the
)ctober Revolution—the authors underscore those aspects of this timely subject
vhich require further study. The reader will find ample criticism in the book of
ourgeois, reformist and revisionist literature which gives a false picture of the
istory of the world's first victorious socialist revolution.

This book is invaluable to Soviet and foreign readers alike.

Erick Dert

Sociology: Analysis and Action

Rabochaya kniga sotsiologa (A Handbook of Sociology), Moscow, Nauka,
76, 511 pp.; *Sotsial'naya struktura razvitogo sotsialisticheskogo obshchestva* v
SR (The Social Structure of Developed Socialist Society in the Soviet Union),
oscow, Nauka, 1976, 224 pp.; *Sotsialisticheskiy obraz zhizni i sovremennaya*
eologicheskaya bor'ba (The Socialist Way of Life and the Ideological Struggle
oday), Moscow, Politizdat, 1976, 350 pp.

TH greater efficiency in managing the economy and other spheres of public
becoming a decisive task of the ruling Communist and Workers' parties, the
e of Marxist-Leninist sociology has increased. Publication of the above three
llective works in the Soviet Union is clear evidence of that.

The first of these books is probably the most complete and systematic
position in Soviet literature of the fundamental problems of Marxist-Leninist
ciology, whose three main functions are described in the book as cognitive,
eological and applied. The authors acquaint the reader with the main lines of
ciological research in the Soviet Union, the organisation and conduct of
ecific investigations and Soviet methods of collecting, analysing and
neralising data.

The second book deals with the theoretical and practical aspects of building a
cially homogeneous society, which is a key task of communist construction.
he authors' preface notes that the problem is being studied very
tensively. Over 200 works on the subject were brought out in the Soviet Union
1966-76. The book analyses the main features and development trends of the
cial composition of Soviet society at this stage.

The third book is not sociological, strictly speaking, but its authors draw on
e findings of sociological research in connection with the problem of

eliminating lingering distinctions in way of ... social gro and with the evolution of the socialist way of ... and in the famil

The three books give an idea of the active role of sociology and sociologist the Soviet Union and reveal the depth and scope of Soviet sociological resea study.

O. Som

State and Church Under Socialism

Michal T. Staszewski, *Panstwo a zwiazki wyznaniowe w europejskich kraj socjalistycznych* (The State and Religious Communities in the Socia Countries of Europe). Warsaw, Ksiazka i Wiedza, 1976, 412 pp.

MOST bourgeois authors describe the socialist countries as states which tak hostile stand on religion and whose citizens are "denied" religous freedom. Tl biassed interpretation is based on the bourgeois ideologists' negative attitude the real civil rights and freedoms guaranteed by the new society and to tl ocialist system as a whole. Michal Staszewski looks into the relationsh etween the state and religious organisations.

Socialism has established its own socio-political system, which is unlike an ther system known before. Within this system, all citizens join in professiona olitical and other public activities irrespective of whether they are believers o heists." The attitude to religion in socialist countries is characterised, on th ne hand, by increasing disengagement of public and cultural life from th fluence of the church, and on the other, the creation of an atmosphere in whicl tensions can develop on religious grounds. These two trends are due to th cular character of the state, which grants full rights to both believers anc heists" (p. 386).

The author writes that the state cannot, however, renounce its prerogative id reserves the right to decide what religious communities can operate legally i its territory. The point is that none of them may compete with the state oı refuse to recognise its prerogatives in any sphere. A religious community which attempts activity of this nature virtually becomes a political organisation.

Analysing the principles of the attitude of the state to the church and believers in the Soviet Union, the author points out that theoretical understanding of these principles, first applied under the new social system, played a notable part in shaping relations between the state and religious communities also in other socialist countries of Europe. The process of drawing believers into socialist construction was a positive development in keeping with the main policy line of the Communist Party.

However, the church leadership, as well as part of the clergy, took, especially in the early period of socialist construction, a stand that did not contribute to progressive social changes. Only gradually did they realise their religious mission under the socialist system.

The author stresses that this process met with great difficulties in relations between the Roman Catholic Church and the socialist state. It was compounded by both the attitude of certain national dioceses, including the Polish diocese, and Roman Catholic dogma.

[illegible]
...people's rule was established in Poland, at applying the principles of
...ation between believers and non-believers. Relations between state and
... benefited from agreements between the diocese and the government
...d in 1950 and 1956 and marking a turn from confrontation to dialogue and
...eration. The policy of the people's state plays a decisive part in this, for it
...onises the interests of believers and non-believers, putting class and public
...ests first. The Communist-Catholic dialogue was also promoted to a degree
...e new policy of Pope John XXIII. As time wore on the Vatican showed
...ing interest in settling relations with socialist countries, and papal
...macy stepped up its efforts for negotiations with these states. These
...iations are concerned with both the status of the church and general
...lems of today, such as the peace problem. The Vatican's new policy has
...ted in agreements with Hungary and Yugoslavia, the establishment of
...matic relations with Cuba and Yugoslavia, and permanent contacts with
Polish government. In the overwhelming majority of socialist countries,
...st all religious communities today recognise the new social system and co-
...ate with the state.

T.W.

Italian Women in Struggle for Equality

Tiso, *I comunisti e la questione femminile* (The Communists and the ...en's Question). Rome, Editori Ruiniti, 1976, 151 pp.

... struggle for equal rights for women enabling them to join actively in public ...has lately acquired new aspects and gained ground in many capitalist ...tries.

...is explains the appearance of books analysing changes in the positions of ...en's organisations and in the attitude of the working-class movement to the problem of complete emancipation for women. Aida Tiso's book is noteworthy for its broad approach to the problem. In surveying the women's liberation movement in Italy since the end of the last century, it gives much space to the presentation of the problem by Marx, Engels and Lenin.

She writes about the radical change in the struggle for women's rights following the Great October Socialist Revolution and about the enormous achievements of the Soviet state in settling the women's question. In the Soviet Union, she notes, employment among women has reached optimal proportions *both quantitatively and qualitatively; women in the world's first country of* victorious socialism make up 48 per cent of the employed. There are fewer women on manual jobs than men, but in mental work women make up 54 per cent, and as much as 76 per cent of the country's doctors.

The author gives a detailed account of the condition of Italian women and shows how their demands for the right to work, equal pay for equal work, a reform of family legislation, and better social maintenance and medical care were

ormulated and specified. "Proceeding from its current demands for freedom and quality, the emancipation movement also calls for a reform of economic tructures, the social, civilian and moral superstructure, thus linking up with the eneral movement of the working people" (p. 108).

This realisation of the objectives which participants in the women's movement hare with all working people did not come overnight. The Communist Party layed a tremendous role in bringing it about. From 1945 to 1970, five national onferences of women Communists were held (the book describes them in some etail). Each conference marked a new stage in the struggle for women's rights. he Union of Italian Women, a democratic mass organisation which seeks unity nd has Communists among its most active members, played a big role in this truggle.

The Italian Communist Party wants to see the movement for women's rights oin on an independent basis in the accomplishment of the general social and olitical tasks of the working class. "There is no doubt that the condition of omen is changing as society changes" (p. 116). The task now is to make the omen's movement, that "essential aspect of the struggle for democratic and ocialist renewal", "thoroughly innovating and revolutionary" (p. 144).

Yevgeny Yaropolov

The Mechanism of the Contemporary Capitalist Crisis

Allgemeine Krise des Kapitalismus. Triebkräfte und Erscheinungsformen in er Gegenwart (The General Crisis of Capitalism: Its Motive Forces and lanifestations Today). Berlin, Dietz Verlag. 1976, 624 pp.

HE first half of the seventies in the capitalist world saw a marked intensification f contradictions affecting every sphere of its life—the economy, politics, leology and culture. The motive forces and main manifestations of the general isis of capitalism today are analysed in detail in the monograph under review, ritten by a research team of the Institute of International Politics and conomy, GDR, under the direction of Professor Lutz Maier.

The authors regard "the deepening general crisis of capitalism as an expression f essential and lasting changes in the internal and external conditions of tistence of contemporary capitalism and, in this context, examine the prospects f the struggle for peace and social progress" (p. 537).

The book points out that the change in the balance of world forces brought oout by the sustained effort of the socialist countries and peace-loving opinion as seriously weakened the international positions and role of capitalism. The ualitative change lies in the fact that the very character of international lations, whose pivot is the contest between the two systems, is being ansformed step by step. This development puts its stamp on political and onomic relations alike.

The general crisis of capitalism has also been substantially aggravated by the al disintegration of the colonial system, in particular by the liquidation of

Portugal's colonial empire in Africa, as well as by the international activity of developing countries and by their gains in the struggle for economic independence and equality.

The authors cite evidence showing that a new crisis situation has also arisen in relations between imperialists. Owing to uneven economic and political development, the scientific and technological revolution and state monopoly integration in Western Europe, the balance of forces between the three centres of inter-imperialist rivalry—the USA, Western Europe and Japan—is steadily changing.

The deterioration of the general crisis of capitalism is also due to a crisis of the present forms of state monopoly control, which the ruling classes had expected to stabilise the capitalist system economically and politically.

The authors point to the growing social and political instability of capitalist society and the progressing crisis of bourgeois ideology. They show that class structures are polarising, the class struggle is intensifying and the monopoly bourgeoisie encounters growing difficulties in trying to preserve its rule at all costs. The book stresses that the working people's class struggle is gaining in anti-monopoly content, turning more and more against the state-monopoly system of bourgeois rule as a whole.

Considerable space is given to the dialectics of the internal and external motive forces of the general crisis of capitalism and to new aspects of the mechanism of their interaction. It is typical of contemporary development, the authors note, that a sharp deterioration of internal capitalist contradictions has coincided with detente, which has led to a further differentiation within the ruling class of capitalist society. And while some members of this class show a degree of realism in estimating world developments and a desire for extensive co-operation with socialist countries, others, being linked chiefly with the military industrial complex, strive to frustrate detente and to come out of the impasse by pressing forward the arms race, engaging in military ventures and adopting extreme reactionary policies.

But the process of detente, while contradictory, affords the struggle for democracy and social progress new opportunities, the authors emphasise.

The book is a serious contribution to the study of the general crisis of capitalism at the present stage. It will undoubtedly arouse interest among numerous readers.

I. Guryev, A. Kulikov

A Turncoat Exposed

Rafael Jose Cortes, *Proceso a la izquierda o desbandada hacia la derecha? Sobre el ultimo libro de Teodoro Petkoff* (The Left on Trial or a Stampede to the Right? On Teodoro Petkoff's Latest Book). Caracas, 1976, 15 pp.

AS in the case of other social movements, vacillating and ambitious elements who leave the ranks of Communists find refuge in the enemy camp. Desertion, that variety of betrayal, has never earned anyone respect. However, bourgeois morality in this epoch of the general crisis of capitalism has gone through such

incredible metamorphoses that reactionary propaganda no longer scruples to sing the praises of renegades, whose services it frankly uses in an effort to split the revolutionary movement.

One of these renegades is Teodoro Petkoff, a former Communist become a "socialist" whose name is ever-present in the columns of the Venezuelan bourgeois press. He is even described as a likely presidential candidate. And of course, the press readily publicises his every anti-Soviet utterance and gloats over his every attack on Venezuela's Communists. It has also given much publicity to Petkoff's latest book, pretentiously entitled *The Left on Trial.*

The Communists of Venezuela counter the revisionists' political manoeuvres intended to perpetuate the division of the country's left-wing forces. They enlighten the masses, using various forms and methods. *The Left on Trial or a Stampede to the Right?* a pamphlet recently published in Venezuela by Rafael Jose Cortes, critically analyses Petkoff's "lates theoretical" constructions.

A leading member of the CPV who took a direct part in the struggle to eliminate the "left" deviation in the Party (its main exponents deserted the Party, Petkoff doing it first (in 1970) and the others following suit (in 1974), R. Cortes could have chosen the easy method of criticising the renegade as an individual or of merely repeating arguments used by Venezuela's Marxists to date. He has resisted the temptation, however, with the result that his work has gained visibly in level of argument and in effectiveness.

The author briefly describes Petkoff's ideological surrender, which has led him to smear Marxism, deny the revolutionary potentialities of the contemporary working class, assail the Communist policy of broad alliances, revise Lenin's doctrine of the party, exonerate the US imperialists' policy, take a hostile stand on the Soviet Union, flirt with the ruling party and attempt a "renewal of socialism".

R. Cortes refutes one by one Petkoff's slanderous attacks on the Soviet Union and other socialist countries. "In building socialism," he writes in conclusion, "serious mistakes and shortcomings occurred under the impact of many factors. But it is just as true that the Communist parties in power removed them in time and took a self-critical view of them. However, this is completely ignored (by Petkoff.—*J. C.*)

Ignoring the socialist countries' social achievements is in itself a concrete reactionary deed" (p. 15).

Virulent anti-Sovietism also prompts Petkoff, who poses as a socialist, to barefacedly advocate "certain forms of co-operation" with imperialism, which is thrusting into Venezuela. "These are all old formulas," R. Cortes notes, "Put forward by traitors to the nation like Haya de la Torre, Betancourt and some others in our America, they also echo falsehoods of the old Social Democratic politicians of Europe" (p. 10).

R. Cortes writes convincingly and scathingly about a distinctive feature of Petkoff's revisionist reasoning, namely, the lack of originality and independence. This ought to give thought to those who applaud this vain "theoretician of socialism". When Petkoff's very first book came out anyone familiar with the zigzags of contemporary revisionism could see without difficulty that Petkoff was simply repeating lies dished up by Isaac Deutscher, Herbert Marcuse, Roger Garaudy and his other notorious forerunners in ideological apostasy, representing their ideas as his own.

Those who merely repeat what others say are aptly called "parrots". There is a tropical parakeet called *cotorra*, a species to which Latin America's anti-Communists definitely belong.

Jeronimo Carrera

In Memorium: Max Reimann

THE working people and Communists of the Federal Republic of Germany and the international Communist movement have suffered a severe bereavement—Comrade Max Reimann, Honourary President of the German Communist Party and Presidium member of its Executive, died in Düsseldorf on January 18, 1977.

Max Reimann was born on October 31, 1898. A worker's son, he himself began his career as a worker and joined in the revolutionary struggle in his early youth. Late in 1918, the Communist Party of Germany was founded and Max Reimann joined it at once. From then on, the life was linked with the German Communists' fight against reaction, fascism and war, for the working people's democratic and social interests, for the great ideals of socialism.

From 1920 onwards, Max Reimann was active in Party work in the Ruhr region. After the Hitler take over, Reimann went underground and continued his anti-fascist, revolutionary activity. In 1939 he was arrested by the Gestapo. But fascist prison and concentration camp could not break his will. In Sachsenhausen he was an active member of the underground Resistance committee.

After the defeat of fascism, Max Reimann returned to the Ruhr, where the Communists elected him leader of the regional Party organisation. In 1948 he became Chairman of the Communist Party of Germany. From 1949 to 1953, he was a member of the Bundestag. In the postwar years, Marx Reimann and West Germany's Communists led by him fought against the restoration of monopoly power, FRG membership of NATO, remilitarisation of the country and the revival of revanchism. With the CPG banned in 1956, he continued his activity in conditions of illegality. He took a determined stand against encroachments on the democratic and social rights of West Germany's working people.

In 1968 Max Reimann hailed the formation of the German Communist Party. The Düsseldorf Congress (1971) elected him Honorary President of the GCP and the Hamburg Congress (1973) elected him to the Presidium of the Party Executive. He made an active contribution to the consolidation of the GCP, helped to extend its influence among the working people and strove for working-class unity on a broad anti-monopoly basis.

True to the principles of proletarian internationalism. Max Reimann fought unremittingly for closer unity and cohesion of the international Communist movement in line with the ideas of Marx, Engels and Lenin. He always favoured good-neighbourly relations between the FRG and the Soviet Union, the German Democratic Republic and other socialist countries. He was a dedicated champion of international detente, European security, disarmament and a change in West German policy towards the socialist countries.

Max Reimann was a gifted, forceful journalist. He contributed to *World*

Marxist Review many articles on the class struggle in the FRG, as well as o
Marxist-Leninist theory, the fight for peace and the international Communi
and working-class movement.

Comrade Max Reimann's memory will live for ever in the hearts c
Communists and progressives of all countries.

Diary

IN connection with the approaching 60th anniversary of the Great Octobe
Socialist Revolution, and at the invitation of the CC CPSU, John Pitman
member of the CPUSA Politbureau, and Satiadjaja Sudiman, member of th
leadership of the CP Indonesia, visited the Soviet Union where they wer
acquainted with the development of socialist democracy in the USSR.

Alberto Kohen, member of the *WMR* Editorial Board and Chairman of th
Commission on Problems of Peace and Democratic Movements, represented th
journal at the World Forum of Peace Forces in Moscow.

Georgos Christodoulidis, member of the Politbureau of the Progressive Part
of the Working People of Cyprus (AKEL) visited the offices of *WMR*. Amon
the questions discussed was developing co-operation between AKEL and th
journal.

Raul Acosta, Deputy General Secretary of the Peruvian Communist Party
visited the *WMR* offices and attended an enlarged meeting of the Commission o
the National-Liberation Movement in Latin American Countries. He describe
the situation in his country and the struggle of its Communists to unite th
democratic forces, Comrade Acosta spoke highly of *WMR*'s work in creativel
elaborating Marxist-Leninist theory.

A *WMR* delegation consisting of Tadeusz Wrebiak, PUWP representative
Georg Kwiatowski, representative of the German Communist Party, and Lui
Padilla, representative of the Communist Party of Bolivia, visited Hungary at th
invitation of the CC HSWP where they were acquainted with the experience o
Hungarian workers in industrial management.

New Books

S. Gaspar, *A szakszervezetek a fejlett szocializmusért* (The Trade Unions i
the Struggle for Developed Socialism). Budapest, Tancsics Könyvkiado, 1976
238 pp.

THIS collection of speeches and articles by a member of the Political Bureau, C
HSWP, General Secretary of the Hungarian Council of Trade Unions, gives a
sound idea of the Hungarian trade unions' role in the economy, politics an
public life generally and of their far-flung international relations.

W. Gerns, *Krise der bürgerlichen Ideologie und ideologischer Kampf in de
BRD* (The Crisis of Bourgeois Ideology and the Ideological Struggle in th

FRG). Frankfurt am Main, Verlag Marxistische Blätter, 1976, 268 pp.
A PRESIDIUM member and Secretary of the GCP Executive looks into various aspects of the ideological struggle in the climate of peaceful coexistence. He refutes the theory of "democratic socialism" as a manifestation of bourgeois ideology and describes the activities of "leftist" groups committed to anti-communism and anti-Sovietism. Much space is given to the West German Communists' effort to foster the class consciousness of the working people and to the struggle for the unity of the world Communist and working-class movement.

R. Ghioldi, *Hegemonia brazilena en el Atlantico Sur?* (Brazilian Hegemony in the South Atlantic?). Buenos Aires, Edicion del autor, 1976, 14 pp.
THE Declaration of the Conference of Communist Parties of Latin America and the Caribbean stresses the need to fight against the expansionist aspirations of US imperialism, which uses the worst reactionaries of Brazil to this end. In line with this conclusion, the author examines the international relations of South American countries. He points to the importance of transforming the region into an area free from nuclear weapons and from the influence of aggressive military blocs and insists on the imperative need to curb the power of multinational companies.

H. Grosse, M. Puschmann, *Wirtschaftsbeziehungen im Zeichen der friedlichen Koexistenz* (Economic Relations in the Context of Peaceful Coexistence). Berlin, Dietz Verlag, 1976, 96 pp.
TWO scholars of the GDR discuss the internationalisation of economic activity as an objective trend of world development today, the failure of attempts by reactionary forces of the capitalist countries to ban economic relations with socialist countries, the fundamental difference between socialist and capitalist economic integration, and the outlook for world economic relations.

G. Cogniot, *Parti pris. 55 ans au service de l'humanisme reel.* Tome I. D'une guerre mondiale a l'autre (Clarity of purpose: Fifty-five Years in the Service of Real Humanism. Vol. I, From One World War to Another). Paris, Editions sociales, 1976, 540 pp.
IN telling the story of his life, a prominent French Communist presents a panorama of the FCP's activity from the day it was founded to 1944. He depicts the Party's formation, the record of *L'Humanité,* of which he was editor-in-chief at one time, the French Communists' active role in the Communist International and their contribution to the liberation of France from nazi occupation. The struggle of the FCP, the author writes, was a struggle for the genuine interests of the workers and other working people.

I. M. Krivoguz, *Osnovniye periody i zakonomernosti mezhdunarodnogo rabochego dvizhenia do Oktyabrya 1917 g.* (The Main Periods and Objective Laws of the International Working-Class Movement Before October 1917). Moscow, Mysl, 1976, 364 pp.
A SOVIET historian examines key aspects of the formation of working-class parties and international proletarian organisations and the internationalist activity of Marx, Engels and Lenin. He divides the international working-class movement prior to the present epoch into periods and describes their objective

ews. A brief historiographical list gives an idea of the current ideological struggle over problems of the history of the working-class movement.

L. Lama, *Intervista sul sindacato* (An Interview on the Trade Unions). Bari, Laterza, 1976, 154 pp.
THE General Secretary of the General Italian Confederation of Labour gives an account of trade union activities in post-war Italy. He devotes special attention to the role of the trade unions in the national economy, and to an analysis of problems of trade union unity and their struggle to end the current national crisis.

J. Targalski, *Ludwik Warynski.* Warsaw, Ksiazka i Wiedza, 1976, 268 pp.
THIS book from a series on people prominent in the Polish working-class movement is dedicated to the 120th anniversary of the birth of Ludwik Warynski, leader of the Proletariat, the first Polish Marxist party, which was active in the 1880s.

H. Winston, *Class, Race and Black Liberation.* New York, International Publishers, 1977, 276 pp.
AN analysis of present-day realities of the United States and African countries leads the CPUSA National Chairman to the conclusion that Lenin's theory of classes and nations is as important and relevant as ever. Henry Winston stresses the intimate connection between the struggle for national liberation and the struggle for social emancipation and demonstrates the falsity of newfangled anti-Communist and anti-Soviet concepts of national liberation. He lays bare the reactionary nature of racist ideology and states the US Communists' position on this issue.

English edition of
PROBLEMS OF PEACE AND SOCIALISM

Theoretical and information journal of Communist and Workers' Parties throughout the world

PUBLISHED IN PRAGUE

WORKERS OF ALL LANDS UNITE

VOLUME 20 APRIL 1977 NO. 4

CONTENTS

Exchange of Views, Discussion

The Press

PROBLEMS OF PEACE AND SOCIALISM

is also published in Arabic, Bengali, Bulgarian, Czech, Danish, Finnish, French, German, Greek, Hebrew, Hindi, Hungarian, Italian, Japanese, Malayalam, Mongolian, Norwegian, Persian, Polish, Portuguese, Punjabi, Romanian, Russian, Singhalese, Spanish, Swedish, Tamilnad, Turkish and Vietnamese.

Enquiries for subscriptions to any of these editions should be sent to Press Circulation Agency, Thakurova 3, 16616 Prague 6, Czechoslovakia.

Published by S. C. Easton, 16 King Street, London, W.C.2., and printed by Farleigh Press (T.U.) Ltd., Watford

The Crucial Event of Our Century

RYSZARD FRELEK
Secretary, Central Committee, Polish United Workers' Party

THERE have been many events that opened or consummated stages in the tempestuous and changing march of world history, events that profoundly affected the destinies of nations. But none has wrought such a fundamental change as the Great October Socialist Revolution. It imparted a new quality to the experience accumulated by mankind. It ushered in an entirely new epoch. For October was the beginning of the profound revolutionary process of liberating labour from exploitation, the peoples from foreign oppression, mankind from war. Consequently, it signified a new phase in the fight for equal rights of individuals and nations, for real democracy in social and international relations.

The greatness of the October Revolution lies in the greatness of its ideas and actions, in its fundamentally new theory and practice. That is why we can say that it was the crucial event of our century, a turning point in world history, the impetus of a movement that was to transform the world. Its influence spread throughout the globe, affecting all areas of human life—economic and social development, ideology, culture and science, law and international relations. And this transformatory process has universal significance, while at the same time preserving, continuing and renewing mankind's progressive legacy.

It is a class process. Lenin described it in these words: "The abolition of capitalism and its vestiges, and the establishment of the fundamentals of a communist order comprise the content of the new era of world history that has set in" (*Coll. Works*, Vol. 31, p. 392).

The transition from capitalism to communism, begun by the October Revolution, is an objective tendency, a law of development. The motive force of this process is the working class, the decisive factor in emancipating labour by demolishing the system of exploitation. The role, strategy and tactics of the proletariat as the hegemon and leading force of this process, as exemplified by the October, were interpretatively generalised by Lenin. One cannot speak of Marxism in separation from Leninism: Marxism-Leninism is the only revolutionary ideology, and it is indivisible and unitary in its very substance. Lenin imparted a new meaning, a new content to the theory and programme of Marxism. On the basis of an analysis of imperialism, he indicated the ways and means of ending its domination. Lenin's Party led the proletariat to victory and founded the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. The triumph of the October Revolution and the emergence of the first socialist state made socialism a practical reality and was a turning point in the development of its theory. The Land of Soviets built under the leadership of the Bolsheviks, of Lenin, became the main bulwark, the main base of all the socialist forces, and played a cardinal part in creating the conditions for the advance of the entire world socialist process.

Sixty years ago socialism existed in only one country, the Russian Soviet Republic. In 1944-45 a new breach was pierced in the world capitalist system. It came as a result of the victory over fascism in World War II and of the liberation and revolutionary struggle of the peoples of Poland, Bulgaria, Yugoslavia,

Albania, Hungary, Romania and Czechoslovakia. The collapse of Hitler's Reich made possible also fundamental changes in the Eastern part of Germany and proclamation of the German Democratic Republic, the first worker-peasant state on German soil. Three main factors contributed to these developments: the struggle of the Communists and their allied popular forces; the emancipating mission and decisive role of the Soviet Union and its invincible Red Army in defeating Hitlerism; the bankruptcy and defeat of the bourgeoisie in World War II, that supreme ordeal for the peoples involved in it.

The Soviet Union's part in defeating militarist Japan changed the situation in Asia and helped its peoples win liberation from imperialist oppression. It enabled the Chinese revolution to score a historic victory, created favourable conditions for the establishment of the Democratic Republic of Vietnam and the Korean Democratic People's Republic, gave new scope to the emancipatory struggle of all other peoples in this vast area. Later, the new alignment of world forces brought about by the USSR and other socialist countries made possible the victory of the Cuban peoples.

These developments culminated in the emergence of the socialist world system. And this system of closely-united socialist countries, concerting their efforts in solving their internal problems and in promoting world peace, became a fundamental factor of mankind's social progress.

The impressive achievements of socialism and of all the progressive forces in the second half of this century are determined not only by the achievements of individual socialist countries and of the socialist system as a whole in building the new society. They are a direct result of the socialist countries' initiative and united action in world affairs. The socialist system has built a firm structure of political, economic and cultural relations; it has jointly evolved the principles of co-operation and mutual assistance and has devised ways and means of strengthening reciprocal ties.

These relations have acquired a new quality and new scope. What we have, in short, is a new type of international relations founded on the principles of socialist internationalism. They rest not only on identity of state interests. For the socialist community is a fraternal family of nations, led by the Marxist-Leninist parties, united in a class alliance by their unity of ideas and aspirations. As Leonid Brezhnev declared at the Seventh Congress of our Party, the socialist community "adds to the strength of each of its members in resolving national problems and greatly multiplies their joint strength and influence in world affairs". Its social and economic achievements, unity and interaction, have made socialism a decisive world factor.

Its positions are steadily being strengthened. By bringing to bear new reserves and making fuller use of the potentialities of their system, the socialist states have in the past ten years significantly accelerated socialist and communist construction and have made considerable progress in satisfying the material and cultural requirements of their peoples. Drawing on their rich experience and following the common regularities of socialist construction in the concrete conditions of their countries, the fraternal parties have started work on the epochal task of building developed socialist society. And in this, too, they are using the immense experience of the CPSU and the achievements of the Soviet people in carrying out the decisions of the 24th and 25th CPSU congresses.

The socialist countries and the world Communist and workers' movement are

being enriched by the theory and practice of Leninism as embodied in the triumph of the October Revolution and in the up-building of the Land of Soviets, and further developed by the CPSU, the Party that first brought this theory and practice to life. The communist ideology, the motive force that is refashioning the world of today, is steadily being developed. The boldest dreams and forecasts of 60, or even 30 years ago seem very modest compared with the achievements of Marxism-Leninism, of existing socialism in the USSR and other socialist countries. Reality has run far ahead of our imagination.

The achievements of existing socialism are today an extremely important factor, one that is exerting powerful ideological, social and political influence on the class struggle in every part of the world. That is why in countries where the bourgeoisie and imperialism hold sway, the ideological struggle against the Communist parties and progressive forces generally is focussed on attempts to belittle these achievements. But there is the proof of history that truth knows no boundaries, and attempts to deny the truth to the people stand no chance of success.

Today the Communist vanguard in the worldwide class struggle is represented by 90 parties with a total membership of over 60 million. Experience has fully corroborated the correctness of their policy in the fight for peace and progress as formulated at the 1969 Moscow International Meeting. New developments on *the various fronts of the class struggle pose new major problems that require joint* discussion and solution.

In Europe there are 33 Communist and Workers' parties with a total membership of more than 30 million. The present social, economic and political situation in developed capitalist countries, notably in Europe, confronts the Communist movement with a number of crucial tasks. Communists in these countries are fighting to prevent the bourgeoisie from shifting on to the working class and the working people generally the entire burden of all the difficulties caused by the crisis, and to prevent a reactionary alternative. And the Communists directly link this with the wider perspective of struggle against national and international monopoly capital, for deep-going structural social and economic changes and for the establishment of democratic government.

The top-priority tasks in capitalist Europe include intensified struggle for genuine democratisation of social relations—prevention of the continued disintegration of parliamentary institutions, now being fiercely attacked by the monopolies; defence of constitutional democratic rights; consistent development and perfection of the strategy of left democratic alliances; mobilisation of the masses to support programmes of democratic social development. In recent years the congresses of many Communist parties of the capitalist West have adopted new programmes setting out their strategy in the fight for a democratic alternative. These programmes have found expression also in the final document of last year's Berlin Conference of European Communist and Workers' parties, in its programme for peace, security, co-operation and social advance on our continent. Proletarian internationalism is a key and tested principle of activity by Communists and their parties. Fidelity to this principle is a fundamental prerequisite ofsuccess in the fight of the entire Communist movement and of each of its parties.

The Great October Revolution brought in a new stage in the people's struggle for freedom, giving it a new dimension and new scope. And this, too, is the result

of Lenin's thoughts and efforts. He made a transcendent contribution to solution of the nationalities question. The Land of Soviets represents a family of equal nations. It accepted and reaffirmed in practice the right of nations to self-determination, down to the formation of independent states. This applies particular to the Polish nation. Lenin regarded the national-liberation struggle as a mainstream anti-imperialist movement, and support of this struggle as a major component of every Party's ideology, and as a basic principle of Soviet foreign policy.

With the victory of the October Revolution, the national liberation movement became an important, inseparable component of the world revolutionary process. There is an obvious direct connection between the pace of disintegration of the colonial system in our age and the slogans of the October Revolution, the rise of the socialist system, its policy and the alignment of world forces it brought about. Furthermore, co-operation with the socialist countries on the principles of equality and mutual benefit helps developing countries fight imperialist exploitation and win full political independence. Also linked with it are the place and role in today's world of the non-aligned countries, which the socialist states regard as a natural ally in the struggle for peace and international security. The non-aligned countries' political and economic initiatives play a prominent part in promoting peace, extending detente to the whole world and providing the conditions for their continued progress. The socialist countries support these initiatives and the struggle to reshape international economic relations. Poland's support for them was demonstrated during the visit which Edward Gierek, First Secretary of the CC PUWP, paid to India not long ago.

October posed the problem of peace in an entirely new manner. It did so by setting up, for the first time in man's history, a social and political system which abolished exploitation and oppression and thus removed the social source of war. It did so also by advancing the slogan of peace as a key goal of the revolutionary movement and by rousing the masses to struggle to achieve this goal.

"Soviet power," says the CC CPSU decision on the Sixtieth Anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution, "showed all the peoples of the globe the only correct way out of the bloody chaos of wars in which the exploiting system involved them. The first official act of the newly-established state was Lenin's Decree on Peace, which announced an explicit and precise programme of struggle for a fair, democratic, universal peace. October ushered in a new epoch, the epoch of mankind's transition from capitalism to socialism, of struggle 'for the liberation of peoples from imperialism, for an end to wars between peoples, for the overthrow of capitalist rule, for socialism' (Lenin)."

The Peace Programme advanced by the 24th Congress of the CPSU and reaffirmed and extended by the 25th has been highly important in the struggle for this goal, which the 1969 Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties defined as the highest goal of mankind. The Soviet Union is the main force in the struggle for world peace, and its leader, Leonid Brezhnev, is the outstanding champion of this most humanistic cause. In his recent speech in Tula, Leonid Brezhnev had every reason to say: "No country has offered mankind so broad, specific and realistic a programme intended to reduce and then fully to eliminate the danger of a new war as the Soviet Union has. This programme includes so paramount a measure as a world treaty banning the use of force in international relations. It

encompasses all fundamental problems arising from the arms race and proposes effective steps to curb it and achieve disarmament ...

"All our peace initiatives are in harmony with the fraternal socialist countries' common line in the international affairs. We strive together for their materialisation. The proposals of the Soviet Union and its friends are backed by dozens of UN member states and by the masses of all continents."[1]

Socialism is a society of emancipated labour, of genuine humanism and social optimism. This is emphasised in the CC CPSU decision on the 60th anniversary of the October Revolution. Socialism, its ideology and practice have always imparted a deeply humanist content to the evolution of mankind, to social relations, to relations between individuals and between peoples.

This profound humanism shapes the attitude of socialism to democracy. It is not capitalism that compels socialism to join in a principled debate on democracy but vice versa, for there can be no genuine democracy without democracy at the basis, in production relations, without just social relations based on the emancipation of labour from exploitation. Nominal bourgeois democracy, which the enemies of socialism constantly invoke, is no substitute for this fundamental criterion of individual freedom.

Socialism is the first system in history to introduce the principles of justice and democracy into the basis, into production relations. It creates a qualitatively new democracy in the superstructure, in the political system, through people's rule, through genuine participation of the masses in government. Socialist democracy is also a democracy in evolution, a democracy whose content, forms and institutions are being continuously enriched. Socialism has much to contribute these matters, for it continues to perfect its system. The transition from the state of the dictatorship of the proletariat to a state of the whole people is a basic prerequisite of continued effort to perfect socialist democracy.

Lately the bourgeoisie has been trying harder than ever to impose its approach to democracy on the Communist parties, accentuating various aspects of nominal democracy. Its aim is to divert attention from the fundamental issue of democracy at the basis, from the monopolies' stepped-up exploitation of the working people, from the social source of acute crisis phenomena, such as recession, unemployment, inflation and a declining standard of life in many capitalist countries.

It is important to examine these problems as they actually present themselves. The class struggle against socialist ideas and forces is intensifying because the ability of imperialism to stem the advance of socialism and the peace offensive of the socialist community is diminishing and because the crisis in capitalist countries is dragging on, leading to a growing radicalisation of the masses. Fierce attacks on the socialist countries, on existing socialism, are among the principal forms of struggle against Communist parties and other progressive forces in capitalist countries.

We repeat: it is not capitalism that compels socialism to engage in a historical debate on democracy but vice versa. And it was the Great October Revolution that determined the nature of the debate.

Poland's Communists and all its people will fittingly celebrate the 60th anniversary of the October Revolution. The decision of the Political Bureau of the CC PUWP says: "Considering the impact which the October Revolution has had on our people's destiny and the significance which close interaction with the

Soviet Union and other socialist countries has for the further progress of ou socialist country, for its growing world role and prestige, we will celebrate th *60th anniversary of the Great October in the spirit of the sincere sentiments an heartfelt wishes which our Party, working class and all our people express t* their Soviet friends on this great day."[2]

The Polish people owe the most important changes ever effected on their soi to the October Revolution, to the formation and development of the Soviet state We mean, first of all, the winning of independence and the fact that our peopl have taken the road of socialist development. Alliance, friendship and fraterna co-operation with the Soviet Union have been the cornerstone of the policy o our socialist state ever since it came into being and have stood the test of life. They have not only afforded us a unique opportunity for rapid economic growth, but have also brought our people a lasting sense of security and the longest period of peace in their history and strengthened the international positions of People's Poland. Our policy is aimed at furthering our fraternal relations with the Soviet Union and other socialist countries in every field.

The development of Polish-Soviet co-operation was raised to a new and highe plane by the recent visit of a Party and government delegation to the Sovie Union. This co-operation is evident in every sphere, in expanding fruitful exchanges of experience between the PUWP and the CPSU, which steadfastl promote Polish-Soviet friendship and co-operation in the vital interests of both peoples. Friendly relations between our two states and their leaderships are becoming closer. Scientific and cultural exchanges have increased substantiall and so have numerous social contacts fostering brotherhood between the two peoples. "Our fraternal relations with the Land of Soviets", said Edward Gierek during the delegation's visit, "are of immense importance to us. Their stead consolidation meets all our national and class interests. This is one of the key conditions for the prosperity of socialist Poland."[3]

The ideas of the October Revolution are being realised in the activity of the socialist world system, the international Communist and working-class movement and the anti-imperialist front as a whole. The impact of the socialist world system makes for deeper revolutionary changes in today's world, this comes about chiefly in the course of fulfilling three inseparable tasks: building communist society in the Soviet Union and a developed socialist society in other socialist countries, promoting peace and international co-operation on an equal footing through the policy of detente, and backing the forces of social progress and national independence. Speaking of international relations at the 25th CPSU Congress, Leonid Brezhnev said that "the positions of socialism go on strengthening and expanding. The victorious of the national liberation movement open up new vistas for the peoples who have won independence. The working people's class struggle against monopoly oppression and the exploiting system is surging high. The revolutionary democratic, anti-imperialist movement is gaining in scope. This is evidence that the world revolutionary process is advancing."

The October Revolution was the beginning of this advance. Its lessons and its fruitful experience are ever present in our activity as they will also be in the future. They are the foundation of socialist theory and practice.

[1]Pravda, January 19, 1977

[2]*Trybuna Ludu*, February 24, 1977

[3]*Trybuna Ludu*, November 10, 1976

Anniversary Preparations

REPORTS are coming in on preparations for the 60th anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution. In celebrating the anniversary, the peoples of the Soviet Union will be joined by those of other countries of the socialist community, by Communists and working people the world over.

A decision on anniversary celebrations in Bulgaria adopted by the Political Bureau, CC BCP, notes the powerful impact of the October Revolution on the life of the Bulgarian people and on the whole of world development in the twentieth century. The occasion will be observed in Bulgaria as a great holiday, the decision says. The staffs of many factories are setting themselves new targets in its honour.

The CC SUPG, State Council, Council of Ministers and National Council of the National Front of the GDR have called on all citizens of the republic to mark the anniversary of the October Revolution in a fitting manner. The appeal speaks highly of the contribution of the CPSU and the Soviet people to peace and social progress.

In Hungary, the staff of the Csepel steel and engineering complex has decided to observe the anniversary by fresh achievements in a socialist construction. Their initiative has been widely taken up in other countries of the socialist community.

America's Communists have formed an anniversary committee to publicise the significance of the socialist revolution in Russia and the progress made in 60 years.

The CC of the Communist Party of Venezuela is planning a series of anniversary conferences, rallies and meetings devoted to the Soviet Union's achievements in building communism and to the international significance of the October Revolution.

In Britain, the anniversary will be observed through a series of social functions, the *Morning Star* has announced.

The CC of the Communist Party of Finland has adopted a decision on the Communists' tasks in connection with the 60th anniversary of the October Revolution and the 60th anniversary of Finland's independence.

Portugal's Communists and democrats are also preparing to commemorate the anniversary. Events devoted to this holiday of the working people of the world are already under way.

The Communist press of Italy, France, the FRG and many other countries carries material on the anniversary. It calls the readers' attention to the progress made by the peoples of the USSR under Soviet rule and writes of the unremitting efforts made by the CPSU and the Soviet state to achieve detente, disarmament and world peace.

Political Democracy and Class Dictatorship

FRANZ MUHRI
Chairman, Communist Part of Austria

DEMOCRACY, individual freedom, national freedom—for decades they have been the subject of heated ideological and political debate, especially sharp in the past few years, and with no signs of it abating in the foreseeable future. For it reflects one of the most salient features of international development, the growth of the forces of democracy and socialism.

In the present social and psychological climate, any party that wants to win political influence finds itself obliged to advocate democracy and offer its conception of freedom, even if the interests of the people and their democratic aspirations are entirely alien to it. For instance, laterly, such conservative forces as the CDU-CSU and their counterpart in Austria, the People's Party, have been trumpeting their championship of freedom which, they allege, is incompatible with socialism.

It is therefore especially important to form a clear picture of the class positions of the participants in this discussion about democracy, which, in the final analysis, is a part of the sharpening ideological class struggle in every capitalist country and on the international scene. Only this approach will reveal the essence of the problem and allow for a discussion of democratic freedoms in the context of class relations.

I

In Austria, the right-wing Socialist Party leaders claim to be the staunchest champions of democracy. Their claim was clearly set out by Bruno Kreisky in his report to the European Forum in Alpbach[1] last September. The report was titled "Freedom and Dictatorship" and this is the picture Kreisky presented to his audience: on the one side there are the "adherents of democracy", that is, those anxious to maintain the existing political structures of developed capitalism. They make up a very broad spectrum of parties and political trends, from the extreme conservatives to the "pink" social-reformists. The only difference between them as Kreisky sees it, is the "time-differential in appreciating the need for social change".[2] On the other side are the "adherents of dictatorship" and chief among them, according to Kreisky, are the Communists. To follow his logic, this is quite natural because the ideology of the Communist movement is linked with the conception of proletarian dictatorship.

Kreisky devoted practically the whole of his report to attacks on the Communists. There was practically no place in this speech, supposedly in defence of freedom, for condemnation of past or present fascism and extreme political reaction, which the Communists have always courageously and consistently fought.

The September 1973 coup (which Kreisky did not even mention) imposed a fascist dictatorship on Chile and made short shrift of all the traditions of political democracy. The democratic revolution of April 25, 1974, put an end to fascist

dictatorship in Portugal. The whole world, and presumably also Kreisky and hi political friends, know on whose side the Communists were in these and man other conflicts between political democracy and political dictatorship—th confrontation of which is typical of 20th century bourgeois society.

The revolutionary working class and Marxists-Leninists have neve questioned the need to work for political democracy, civil rights and freedom They have been the most active participants in democratic movements. W Austrian Communists have always been guided by Lenin's proposition that th road to social emancipation of the working people, the road to socialism, canno bypass democracy. The Communist Party of Austria conceives the struggle fo the socialist future of our country only on the basis of maximum, deep-going an comprehensive democratisation of public life, on the basis of decisive resistanc to all attempts to curtail the rights and freedoms of the working people, of th masses.

This alone exposes the fallacy of counterposing the Communists' position t the ideals of democracy. But from the point of view of our bourgeois an reformist opponents, the touchstone of democracy is the attitude to the concep of proletarian dictatorship. Those who accept that concept are categoricall denied the title of democrats. Why? Because, we are told, democracy an dictatorship are incompatible.

This is a fraudulent presentation of the question, a method the enemies of th working class have used for decades. It is not a case of error resulting fron delusion or ignorance, but a gross, deliberate forgery, for the social-reformis leaders know perfectly well that in our theory the category of class dictatorship i not synonomous with the concept of political dictatorship.

In his Alpbach speech Kreisky did all he could to obscure this fundamenta difference and make out that negation of democracy was from the very outse intrinsic in Marx's doctrine of the class struggle and proletarian dictatorship. I fact, Kreisky said: "There can hardly be any doubt that it was Karl Marx wh provided the historical and moral substantiation of domination throug coercion and dictatorship, when he enunciated the concept of proletaria dictatorship".[3] In reality Marx, and later in greater detail Lenin, showed tha every state is an instrument of the domination of a definite class. The theory o the class struggle formulated by the Marxist-Leninist classics and developed t recognition of the need for proletarian dictatorship is a scientific explanation o the objective laws of social development at the stage of society's inevitabl transition from capitalism to socialism. It shows the need to establish workin class power, which Marx defined as the dictatorship of the proletaria Incidentally, in our view, the employment or non-employment of this concept b one or another Communist Party is not of decisive importance. What i important is the *essence* of this scientific category, the *content* which Mar Engels and Lenin imparted to it. And this retains all its validity in the present, i many ways changing conditions and forms of transition to socialism, for suc propositions as the leading role of the working class, the introduction of broa democracy for the working people, the resolute attack on the positions of th exploiting minority, etc., are fully relevant today too.

The absurdity of the allegation that anti-democracy was intrinsic in Marx' theory from the very outset becomes especially obvious if we bear in mind tha Marxism extends the concept of class dictatorship not only to socialist societ

where the working class is the dominant class, but also to capitalist society. Class dictatorship, i.e., *the concentration of state power in the hands of a definite class, does not yet signify the absence of democracy.* For the Marxists this is just as irrefutable as the fact that political democracy represents a class dictatorship, i.e., the domination of a definite class expressed in concrete political forms. Now as in the past, social and political realities fully confirm the theoretical proposition expressed in the following words of Lenin: "... The dictatorship of a *single* class is necessary not only for every class society in general, not only for the *proletariat* which has overthrown the bourgeoisie, but also for the entire *historical period* which separates capitalism from 'classless society', from communism. Bourgeois states are most varied in form, but their essence is the same: all those states, whatever their form, in the final analysis are inevitably the *dictatorship of the bourgeoisie.* The transition from capitalism to communism is certainly bound to yield a tremendous abundance and variety of political forms, but the essence will inevitably be the same: the *dictatorship of the proletariat*" (*Coll. Works,* Vol. 25, p.413).

II

Let us analyse the interconnection between political democracy and class dictatorship, taking Austria as an example.

Austria's political structure has not been mutilated by a military-police regime like the one that existed in Portugal under Salazar and Caetano, Franco's Spain or in the Greece of the Black Colonels. We have a Parliament elected by universal suffrage, a pluralism of political parties, media, etc. The political administration system has all these customary attributes of bourgeois democracy. But if we examine the substance of the various forms of Austrian democracy, if we take a closer look at how its institutions function, we shall have to conclude that Austria's political life bears the strong imprint of the ideology and practice of "social partnership".

How this affects the destinies of Austrian democracy will be seen from the following example. Under the Constitution, Parliament is the supreme authority, a forum expressive of the sovereign will of the people. In practice, however, Parliament is increasingly becoming a formal institution. For all its decisions are predetermined by the all powerful institutions of "social partnership", composed of top officials of employer organisations, chambers of commerce, the social-reformist trade unions and the government.[4]

In his Alpbach speech Kreisky was very much concerned about the extra-Parliamentary threat to democracy. He would have been more logical if he had said that the threat to democracy in Austria comes from an extra-Parliamentary centre of power, founded and strengthened by the "social partnership" system. Parliament's function has been reduced merely to rubberstamping the agreements reached by the "partners".

Nor are the Communists the only ones who are aware of this state of affairs. The facts are so obvious that very often the social-reformists and representatives of the bourgeoisie find themselves obliged to comment on the situation. The Left Socialists openly criticise and reject "social partnership".

It is no secret that Austrian democracy is caught up in a process of internal erosion. And assessing this from a scientific, Marxist-Leninist standpoint, one cannot avoid the conclusion that the evolution of Austria's political system is

subject, in specific national forms, to the laws governing the destinies of bourgeois democracy in this age of imperialism and the domination of state-monopoly capitalism. The interests of the bourgeoisie have come into conflict with the standards of bourgeois democracy. Things have not yet reached the point of outright curtailment and violation of democratic procedures and rituals. The facade of democratic institutions is still there, but their substance is being more and more emasculated or entirely destroyed to suit the selfish demands and interests of capital.

An essential feature of "social partnership" as a specific Austrian form of state-monopoly capitalism is that it functions regardless of the Parliamentary majority or the make-up of the government. In the fifties and early sixties there was a coalition government of the People's and Socialist parties. The People's Party had a majority in Parliament and appointed the Federal Chancellor. In 1966-69, it had an absolute majority, with the Socialists in opposition.

The Social-Democrats came to power for the first time in 1970 and since 1971 have had an absolute majority in Parliament. However, despite all these changes, "social partnership" continues to dominate Austrian political life. And so, the advent to power of an independent Social-Democratic government did not signify a change of policy, let alone the transfer of power from one class to another. On the contrary, the class domination of capital was not only preserved, but continues to find expression in the pursuit of a "social partnership" policy. Going back on its election promises, the Kreiskv government did not offer a realistic alternative, on any substantial issue, to the policy of the People's Party government. This is clear proof that the content of any political system (including a democratic one) is determined by the dominant class.

Let us approach from another angle this question of the interconnection between political democracy and class dictatorship in the capitalist world of today. In his Alpbach speech Kreisky made this significant statement: "..political democracy has proved incapable of solving most of the difficult problems posed by the grave world economic crisis."[5]

He singled out three problems with which the "democratic government" tried to cope. First, undercapacity operation of industry, illustrated by the fact that most of the world's merchant fleet lays idle, and the ship-building industry is in a state of profound crisis. Second, the declining prices on aluminium and steel alloys. And third, and most important, unemployment. (Despite the economic pick-up, there are, according even to official figures, about 15 million jobless in the industrial capitalist countries.) Such, then, is the state of affairs in the capitalist world.

The sharp crisis developments in the capitalist economy are not caused by society's political institutions, but by the class structure of the economy, the contradictions arising out of the domination of monopoly, the inherent antagonism between labour and capital. The impotence of political democracy, of which Kreisky spoke, is only natural under capitalism.

The domination of monopoly capital engenders a very strong tendency to curtail political democracy. We have already shown how this operates in Austria. It also operates, in one or another form, to a greater or lesser degree, in other countries of state-monopoly capitalism. Hence, the need to fight for democracy, that is, against the omnipotence of the monopolies, against their encroachments on the rights, freedoms and gains of the workers and the popular masses. The

value of each success in this struggle is beyond all doubt. But, at the same time, experience has taught us Austrian Communists how right Lenin was when he wrote: "The domination of finance capital and of capital in general is not to be abolished by *any* reforms in the sphere of political democracy . . . " (Vol. 22, p. 145). And this is understandable, for the relation of political democracy to class dictatorship is that of form to content. Austria's experience has shown: if the bourgeoisie, the monopolies, retain the key social and economic positions that assure their domination over society, even the broadest democracy remains bourgeois democracy, i.e. a form of dictatorship of the bourgeoise. This has been confirmed, in particular, by Socialist Party sociologists and publicists when they refer to the growing "concentration of power" in the economy and other areas of Austrian life.

III

An understanding of the substance of every capitalist state as domination of the bourgeoisie (which does not mean that we see no difference between bourgeois democracy and fascism!) has always, we believe, been of vast importance for the strategy and tactics of the revolutionary working class. We are convinced that today, too, this cardinal Marxist-Leninist propostion provides definite guidelines for the Communist effort to unite the democratic forces for the attainment of progressive aims. In Austria this means the achievement of anti-monopoly democracy. In campaigning for the unity of all democrats, we know that in this broad alliance there are bound to be different views and attitudes, even contradictions. But the very possibility of forming such an alliance, the rationale of its existence, its viability and activity, rest on a firm objective basis, a common interest in upholding and promoting democracy.

Of course, this common interest arises not because all the elements of this alliance are attracted by the word "democracy", but rather because the objective position of various groups and strata of contemporary bourgeois society impels them to fight economic and social oppression by big capital and the government machine that serves it. In other words, in this case, too, it is the choice made by one or another group in the concrete conditions of class struggle and class relations that gives the concept "democracy" its real meaning. Acccept the domination of monopoly capital or fight it?—that question is the touchstone of genuine democratic convictions.

Millions in the capitalist countries have made that choice, moved by their social instinct or on the basis of their political experience. For Marxists-Leninists it is also substantiated by scientific theory.

We are fully aware that imperialism, state-monopoly capitalism, not only suppresses (though never entirely abolishes) free market competition, but also uses every available means to restrict political democracy (which, incidentally, does not at all imply its complete abolition). The root of the menace to democracy lies in the very nature of monopoly capital. And this menace is all the more real and more tangible, the sharper the contradictions of capitalism become and the more painfully crisis developments are felt. It has visibly increased with the crisis afflicting world capitalism in the 70s.

In this historical situation, the Communists are working to unite the popular forces to fight monopoly domination. They are thus offering a course of social and political development that accords with the interests of democracy.

Many Social-Democrat leaders have spoken of the crisis of, and danger to, democracy in capitalist society. But they try to create the impression that the danger emanates mainly from the left, from the Communists.

In concluding his Alpbach report, Kreisky spoke eloquently of the need to perfect democracy. This, he said, was the "task of our time, the confrontation between freedom and dictatorship",[6] and Kreisky left no doubt that he was referring to the struggle against "Communist dictatorship". That attitude is not new. Speeches of this kind could be heard in Germany in the early 30s. Forty years later similar speeches were repeated when the Popular Unity government came to power in Chile. And now, flouting all the lessons of history, there is a revival of the fictitious "Communist menace to democracy".

What is behind this persistent repetition? We will not be in error if we say that the roots of this attitude lie in the interests of the ruling class, the bourgeoisie, the monopolies, for more than anyone else they are interested in diverting public attention from their own menace to the democratic institutions of society and the rights of the people. Today, with the deepening of the crisis of bourgeois democracy, this has become a vital ideological and political necessity for the monopolies. And it is to their advantage to have the charge of anti-democracy hurled at their most consistent opponents, representatives of the working class and working people. In helping the monopolies achieve that, the right-wing Social-Democratic leaders are working hand-in-glove with forces that represent the greatest peril to democracy. They are also helping to strengthen the omnipotence of monopoly capital, which today is the concentrated expression of the class domination of the bourgeoisie.

And so, if the social-reformist leaders, among them Kreisky, claim to be champions of democracy, this applies only to bourgeois democracy. And if we take their attitude to dictatorship, we can definitely say that they were and remain supporters of bourgeois dictatorship.This explains why in the past, at difficult and critical times for democracy, the ideologists and politcal leaders of social-reformism were unable to see the source of the danger and did not want to take the only correct road, the road of unity with the most consistent democratic rces. It explains also the present policy of the Austrian Social-Democratic adership, their obsessional anti-Communism, which is both a reflection of their oncern to maintain bourgeois dictatorship and an impediment to the evelopment of an effective struggle for democracy.

The Austrian Social-Democrat ideologists try to justify their "social artnership" policy by pleading that the workers and employers "are in the same oat". And from this they conclude that the class struggle, especially the political ass struggle, has lived out its day, and even contradicts the principle of emocracy. What we have is an attempt to paralyse the working class. But uccessful defence and extension of democracy are possible only through joint ruggle of the working class and all labouring strata. The "partnership" ideology a retreat from class positions and from the socialist perspective. Hence, the fort to bring to the working class an understanding of its position and its istorical role requires struggle against the ideology and practice of "social artnership".

The Communist Party of Austria is consistently guided by the Marxist-eninist proposition that the road to socialism, i.e., the overthrow of bourgeois omination, is also the road to extending the rights and freedoms the working

ople have won under [illegible] rights of
people and the functioning of demo[illegible] [illegible]itatively new
ntent that accords with the social, economic [illegible] requirements of
ciety, of the labouring masses, of the individual. [illegible] emphasise that as
ng as there is the class domination of capitalism, no achievements of
emocracy can be long-lasting. And, conversely, consistent democracy for the
orking class, the working people, can be achieved only through the socialist
estructuring of society.

In the fight for socialism via anti-monopoly democracy, for stage-by-stage estriction of the power of big capital, we are striving for equal co-operation of several parties in the leadership of the revolutionary process which will transform society. This is expressive of our conviction that the majority of those involved in organised political movement in Austria place the defence and development of democracy above concern for keeping alive the system of state-monopoly capitalism.

---

[1]An annual gathering of conservative political, media and cultural personalities.

[2]*Arbeiter Zeitung*, September 4, 1976

[3]*Arbeiter Zeitung*, September 4, 1976.

[4]*"Social partnership" is one of the main economic and social mechanisms of Austrian state-monopoly capitalism. The "partners" are big business and the leadership of the Socialist-controlled trade union federation. Through a ramified network of agencies, notably the "party commission on wages and prices", they shape and implement economic and social policy in the interests of the nonopolies. (For more details see Ernst Wimmer's article, "Social-Democracy and 'Social 'artnership'. in WMR for October 1974.)*

Arbeiter Zeitung, September 4, 1976.

Arbeiter Zeitung", September 4, 1976

Social and Economic Policy in the Period of Building Developed Socialism

LUBOMIR STROUGAL

Central Committee Presidium Member, Communist Party of Czechoslovakia, and Head of the Czechoslovak Government

THE thoughts and efforts of Communists in the socialist countries are now centered on man, on creating conditions for his all-round, harmonious development. This aspect of the policy of the ruuling Communist and Workers' parties stands out most clearly in building developed socialism and communism. The documents of the last party congresses show that, using available resources and potentialities, the socialist countries are following a strategy of social development focused on man, on satisfying his constantly rising material and cultural requirements. The humane content of this strategy has found expression in closer interconnection and organic unity of economic and social policy.

Importance of the Problem

In the Central Committee Report to the 25th CPSU Congress, Genera[illegible] [illegible] basic socio-economic tasks as relating primaril

[illegible]
round development of the personality, perfection of the socialist way of [illegible]
dressing the 15th Congress of our Party, its General Secretary, Gustav H[illegible]
phasised the vast importance of implementing the programme of "conti[illegible]
d even improvement of all elements that go into the standard of liv[illegible]
engthening people's confidence in society, perfecting the socialist way of life."
The process of achieving unity of social and economic policy raises a number
theoretical and practical questions: what is the essence of the concept of
cialist humanism, that underlying principle of communist policy? How is this
ity achieved at various stages of socialist construction? What are the
racteristic features of this policy in present-day conditions, and several other
estions.

In finding the answers we do not, of course, have to begin from scratch. For the
rxist-Leninist classics have given us guide lines for the solution of even the
st complex problems. However, we are fully aware that application of general
nciples to the solution of concrete problems in concrete historical situations is
only an art, but also a science, and one that requires the constant enrichment
continued creative development of these principles, which, in turn, raises
questions.

he purpose of this article is to examine some of them, chiefly in the light of
Party's experience. We believe that exchange of views on unity of social and
onomic policy is of great value for internationalising the accumulated
perience of the fraternal parties operating this policy in their respective
ountries, and also for waging the ideological struggle in which, as we know, the
roblems of humanism, value orientations, the criteria of a way of life worthy of
man, hold a very prominent place. For many years now existing socialism has
served as an inspiring example of a society which has brought the working people
freedom from exploitation, social and national oppression, poverty and all the
other evils of capitalism, assured dynamic economic development, a steady rise
in prosperity standards, all-round development of the personality. In other
words, it is becoming increasingly clear that socialism offers a convincing
alternative to a society of which economic, political, spiritual and moral crises is
an intrinsic part.

Socialism's Record

In a socialist society economic and social development is subordinated to the interests of the working people, the interests of each memember of society. This general law stems from the very nature of socialism as the genuine embodiment of humanist ideals. The production of material values and the achievements of culture, the entire system of social relations, serve the working people.

However, the possibilities of satisfying material and cultural requirements are not the same at different development stages of socialist society and in different countries. There are many reasons for that: the inherited differences in social and economic levels; the need to accelerate the building of the material and technical basis of socialism in formerly backward countries, and restructure industry and agriculture in developed countries; the need also to strengthen their defence capacity in the face of imperialist military threats, which was especially important in the cold war period, etc.

perseverance in solving other social problems, such as assuring an adequate supply of clothing, shoes, etc. We can now say that our ambitious housing programme, reconstruction of old buildings, environmental improvement and the provision of new comfortable flats, has in this respect too put Czechoslovakia among the most advanced nations.

From the very early days of socialist construction our Communist Party adopted a policy of comprehensive social maintenance, on the premise that socialism creates a new pattern of society's attitude to the people, the family, the aged. Every year our government assigns more money for public health, education, culture, old-age pensions, sick benefits, assistance to new families, child care, etc. And this expenditure is increasing at a faster pace than personal incomes. Thus, in 1961-76 wages and other earned incomes increased 120 per cent, whereas grants to the population out of social consumption funds, i.e., expenditure on the social needs of the people and on free services, increased 190 per cent, which means that their share in income rose from 37 to 47.5 per cent.

In the early 70's our social services were extended by a wide-ranging programme of mother-and-child care and assistance to large families. This changed the long and negative demographic tendency, as a result of which the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic had one of the lowest birth rates in Europe; today it has the third highest.

Mention should also be made of our progress in public health. Czechoslovakia was the first country in the world to eliminate poliomyelitis. Our system of free medical care has solved an old and burdensom problem—the need to pay for treatment, especially in cases of chronic sickness.

We can look back on a period of considerable achievement also in culture. Even in the early years of socialist construction, Czechoslovakia held a top place in Europe in the number of theatres, cultural institutions, etc.

We have removed all class barriers to education at every level. The student body of our higher and secondary schools reflects the social structure of our society, in which the working class is the most numerous and leading class. For the first time in Czechoslovak history the level and scale of education are ahead of the requirements of the economy, but we accept that because our aim is to create the basic preconditions for the all-round development of the ability, talent and social activity of every member of society. How radically our education system has changed can be judged, for example, from this fact: today Slovakia has three times more university instructors than bourgeois Slovakia had university students.

In its economic policy the Communist Party has always given priority attention to creating the necessary prerequisities for removing the differences in social and economic development levels of our two fraternal nations, the Czech and the Slovak, as a cardinal element of national equality. Industrialisation has changed the image of once backward Slovakia. Its share in total industrial output in 1937 was less than 8 per cent, today it is 27 per cent. The sharp difference in living standards and living conditions between Czechs and Slovaks, so characteristic of the old bourgeois republic, has disappeared.

New Stage, New Goals

The social and economic development programme for the current five-year period and subsequent years takes into account the potentialities of our society

and the magnitude and nature of the social tasks that arise objectively as we advance to developed socialism. Naturally, their fulfilment depends in decisive measure on dynamic economic development through more efficient production and more rapid scientific and technological progress. The Party also proceeds from the fact that at a time when we are solving the problem of linking the STR with the advantages of socialism, to raise the working people's standard of life is essential to economic development and a key prerequisite of fast-growing production. This concept of the oneness of economic and social development underlies the policy adopted by the 15th Party Congress.

The Congress stressed the great importance of fostering people's creative abilities and moulding a socialist way of life. Its decisions are aimed at continuing to mould that way of life, which is not limited to growing material consumption but implies meeting all requirements, material and spiritual alike. Gains in achieving social objectives also find reflection in the level of social, political and ideological unity of society, which is led by the working class, and of unity of the working people behind the Party. Besides, they express themselves in a gradual elimination of class distinctions and in growing unity of the interests of all classes and social groups, in the development of socialist democratic principles.

Thus, Czechoslovak society is developing as an integral social, economic and political system, on its own, socialist basis. It has a powerful economic, scientific and technological potential and has gone very far in meeting the people's material and spiritual requirements. One may well ask: What should the main guidelines of further social and economic development be in these circumstances? What is the reasonable limit in meeting material and spiritual requirements? What should be the priorities? How are we to prevent the desire for material well-being from sidetracking spiritual growth and ideological and moral maturity? What role should the Party's social and economic policy play in this respect?

In answering these questions, it is necessary to bear in mind the essential features and potentialities of developed socialism, which is a new stage on the road to communism. Developed socialism combines the achievements of the STR with the advantages of the socialist economic system and puts the emphasis on intensive methods of economic development. It is characterised by a qualitatively new level and scale of production, which make possible a steadily rising standard of living and guarantee the harmonious development of every aspect of public life. The laws of socialism are operating in every sphere of social life and, indeed, are acquiring decisive importance. And this brings to the fore the problem of interaction of all the aspects of socialist society as one entity.

Speaking at the 15th Party Congress, Gustav Husak, General Secretary of the CC CPCz, defined the main features of developed socialism as follows: "A developed socialist society, whose construction is the content of this stage, is characterised, first of all, by combination of the achievements of the scientific and technological revolution with new social relations and by comprehensive fulfilment of political, social, economic, cultural and ideological education tasks, which makes it possible to meet people's steadily growing requirements."

Our experience suggests that with more intensive economic development, a greater accent on scientific and technological progress, more efficient organisation of production, growing skills and a richer pattern of relations between people, the results of economic development acquire a different

character. To be specific, economic development leads not only to quantitative changes but—in much greater measure—to qualitative ones, for it sets in motion deep-lying factors promoting the development of socialist society; there arise new requirements and values, the nature of people's work and the scope of this public activity change, their standards of education and qualifications rise. In other words, intensive economic progress necessarily brings out the latent abilities of the working people.

It follows that in the period of building a developed socialist society, the all-round social development of the individual, of all working people, stands out more and more as the immediate *aim* of socialist construction. At the same time, it serves as a new powerful *means* of this construction. And it is here that the deepest source of the strength and advantages of socialism lies, a source beyond capitalism's reach.

Accordingly, the socialist way of life also has a two-fold aspect. It is the social objective of economic, scientific and technological progress and, on the other hand, it is itself an active factor in this progress. By developing it consciously and meaningfully, it becomes possible to ensure that allocations for social needs are used properly, that is, for fostering the working people's abilities, and not wasted in purely consumer fashion or to the detriment of people's abilities or health.

Only a system in which all economic, technolgical, social, political and cultural changes are closely interconnected can consciously set social objectives and achieve them one by one. This no longer implies merely overall, quantitative increase in production and consumption, a rising standard of life, and so on. The qualitative aspect is becoming the important factor. The decisive question is one of priorities, of the items to be produced on a particularly large scale, the services to be expanded first of all, the standards to be maintained in satisfying material and cultural requirements, the standards which education and qualifications should meet and the likely impact of all this on the way of life of the individual and society.

A fact of great social significance in this respect is the changing nature of labour, such as the mechanisation of auxiliary and monotonous jobs, especially loading and unloading, the provision of the service industries with more technical facilities, and measures to protect and improve the environment. Economising on labour is not merely a matter of economising on the wage fund. It also means gradually eliminating hard, unskilled work and using the worker's abilities for more productive activity. With this approach, the worker's educational standard cannot be assessed solely in terms of the immediate skilled labour requirements of production and society. Account must also be taken of the value and significance of this indicator as an independent factor in scientific, technological and social progress, in the working people's creative effort.

It is just as evident that a narrow view of production efficiency should give way to a broad socio-economic conception of the efficiency of social production and socio-economic planning and management, at the level of both individual socialist countries and the socialist community as a whole. Man's all-round development is the main goal of the Communist movement and the fundamental value of socialist society. It is a powerful factor in human progress and its highest goal. This was how Marx, Engels and Lenin approached the matter, and the course of development of the socialist countries, primarily of the Soviet Union,

The social policy of the Communist parties of socialist countries is not restricted to adjusting current economic laws or to gearing them to popular needs. It regulates the whole range of relations between classes and social groups, between the collective body and the individual, and is based on materialising the programme goals of socialism and communism, that is, achieving complete social equality, conceived as the all-round development of every individual.

We have created a society that is not divided into hostile classes but characterised by increasingly close bonds beteeen class and social groups. There is no such thing in this society as extremes of poverty and wealth, for all of society's wealth belongs to those who create it by their labour.

Socialism is thus the first society in history having no closed, strictly isolated social groups, a society with an open and dynamic structure of interests reflecting relations of co-operation between all its members. This creates the prerequisites for achieving complete social equality.

Our interest in further progress on these lines is not prompted by philanthropic considerations, nor by an egalitarian tendency. It is inseparable from the social objectives we have set ourselves and is based on careful analysis of the conditions in which these objectives can be achieved. We hold that, as we have already stressed, the development of the abilities and qualities of each at this stage of socialist construction is a requisite for the development of socialist society as a whole.

The advancing STR has given rise in the West to a spate of views and concepts alleging a total split of society into the scientific and technological "elite" and those outside it. A fact of invaluable importance in refuting such concepts is that in Czechoslovakia and other socialist countries, science and knowledge are neither "private intellectual property", nor a source of social privilege but serve all working people.

Our country's entire economic and social policy as defined by the 15th Party Congress, like the policy pursued by other countries of the socialist community, is based on the principle "Everything for man, everything for his development". With every step forward, this principle gains and will gain in importance in our society and will be applied ever more fully and consistently because it combines the programme goals of our movement and the most powerful sources and potentialities which socialist society can draw on in its forward movement.

Real and Alleged Humanism

For the first time in history, socialism has turned humanism from a dream into a concrete task, into the meaning and content of people's revolutionary activity. Strictly speaking, humanism put into practice as comprehensively as possible is socialism, a system gradually developing into communism, and the road to it leads through one of the most radical transformations in social history. This is why the question of the fundamental goal of socialism, If its nature, the forms of trransition to it and the ways and means of building it, is constantly in the focus of ideological struggles.

When, six decades ago, the working people of Russia led by Lenin's Party set about building socialism, bourgeois propaganda bombarded the world with "evidence" supposed to show that however attractive in theory the socialist ideal may be, there have never been, and never will be, means for its materialisation, so that socialism will always be no more than a dream. This allegation was repeated

in every way after World War II, when socialism became a goal for working people of several East European and Asian countries.

Now that no one can deny the vast progress made by the socialist countries in production, consumption and the application of scientific and technological achievements, hostile propaganda approaches the problem of socialism from a different angle. It counterposes the aims and means of socialist change, its significance and the ways of effecting it, saying that the only result of the socialist revolution is economic progress, the more rapid industrialisation of what had been more or less backward countries. According to opponents of Marxism-Leninism and existing socialism, socialism "sacrifices" man to advance production and sees in the individual only an instrument for achieving economic objectives, and hence existing socialism has nothing to do with "genuine socialism", "humane socialism", "socialism with a human face", and so on.

These allegations, which bear no resemblance to reality, are prompted by perfectly obvious considerations. They are designed, first of all, to conceal from the working people of non-socialist countries the fact that working class and other working people of socialist countries are no longer an object of capitalist exploitation but real builders who actively use the means of production and available resources to advance society and man. One of the principal aims of anti-communist propaganda is to reduce or paralyse if possible the working people's socialist acitivity, which in socialist countries is boosted by social, technological and economic changes.

The bourgeoisie's propaganda attacks on existing socialism are also prompted by the desire to divert attention from the current deep crisis of capitalism. Relatively rapid progress in science, technology and production over the past decades, often artificially accelerated by quickening the pace of the STR to save the capitalist system, takes an irrational form, the form of fatal spontaneous processes, many of them disastrous, owing to the inability of capitalism to make economic, scientific and technological progress serve the working man. They are accompanied by recurrent imbalances in the "metabolism" of society and nature, by deformations of social production resulting from the arms race and enormous military spending.

Manifest today is the inability of the wealthiest and technologically most advanced capitalist countries to solve social problems in the working people's interest and provide social and production conditions really in keeping with the interests of the masses. Bourgeois ideologues refuse to admit that while historical causes have so far prevented existing socialism from outstripping industrially developed capitalist countries in productivity level, it has, nevertheless, demonstrated its ability to place all material and spiritual resources at man's disposal. They argue, therefore, that socialist and communist construction, which requires intensive economic development and the use of modern science and technology, is bound to have the same disastrous consequences resulting from the STR as have already given rise to disaappointment and protest among the working people of the West. Bourgeois propaganda tries to reduce the influence exerted on people's minds by the fact that the socialist countries have already attained a level of economic development enabling them to solve the problem of providing optimal material and cultural standards for the working people. The key to this solution is the unbreakable unity of the social and ... the Communist and Workers' parties.

Under socialism, the measures adopted for the good of man, for the formation and development of the working people's material and spiritual requirements, are not merely an embellishment of economic policy designed to improve its image. On the contrary, they express the internal objective goal, the meaning and essence of socialist society and its economic development. They are an imperative of socialist development itself, with the overall growth of the working people's abilities being regarded as the goal of social progress and a decisive factor in accelerating it. In this process, the development of every individual is a prerequisite for the development of all members of society, and conversely, every individual needs the development of all as a means of enriching his own life.

Party Experience

Peace in the Middle East: A Sheet Anchor for Israel

MEIR VILNER

General Secretary, Communist Party of Israel

THE years of struggle have shown the Communists of Israel the undeniable truth that their achievements originate in their principled internationalist positions that are based upon the teachings of Marxism-Leninism creatively applied to the particular conditions of Israel. Under the complex and changing conditions the Party has to come up with the right answers and provide correct solutions to the numerous problems facing it.

Take, for instance, the Middle East problem. In their unrealistic and adventurist position, the ruling circles in Israel ignore the viewpoint of the majority of the nations of the world, as expressed in the decisions of the UN Security Council and General Assembly. They ignore world public opinion, which demands the elimination of the dangerous hotbed of war in the Middle East. They completely belittle the sovereignty of the neighbouring Arab states, which is confirmed by the intervention in Lebanon. Their nationalist and militarist arrogance is especially expressed by their attitude to the national rights of the Palestine Arab people. The desire for territorial annexations and the denial of the rights of this people are one of the foundations of the official Israeli Zionist policy.

The Israeli government is directing all its efforts toward obtaining from the USA the biggest possible allocations of modern weapons and the largest possible sums of money for their acquisition. At the same time it brands any peace initiative as a move against the existence of the State of Israel.

The reactionary bourgeois-class policy of the powers that be is a policy of pro-imperialism, anti-Communism and anti-Sovietism. In the struggle in the international arena between the forces coming out for detente and peaceful coexistence among states of different social systems, on the one hand, and the forces aspiring to renew the cold war and international tension, on the other, the Israeli govenment sides with the latter, as it obviously feels apprehensive at the

prospect that consolidation of detente and peace might put an end to the occupation of the Arab areas and bring justice to the Palestine Arab people.

One of the difficult problems encountered by our Party is how to lead the workers in Israel, the youth, the Israeli people in general, to a realistic vision of events in the Middle East and the rest of the world, since the media in Israel—radio, television and the majority of newspapers—detach almost completely the problems of Israel from the problems of the world, from the new correlation of forces in the international arena, from the changed correlation of forces in the Middle East and from the perspective of historical development in our region and the world. It is the duty of the Communist Party to tell the working people the truth about the situation in Israel and elsewhere, and help them to form the broadest front of struggle against occupation, for peace, democracy and social progress. The 18th Congress of the Communist Party of Israel proved to be a landmark along the road to this goal, an outstanding event in the history of our Party.

Communist Influence is Growing

The 18th Congress of the CPI, convened in Haifa on December 15-18, 1976, summed up the Communists' activities over the preceding four and a half years. It demonstrated the ideological, political and organisational unity of the Party, the increase of its influence in the life of society and manifested the firmness of its Jewish-Arab unity, which has been cemented in the big political struggles of the last few years that have impressed their stamp on the political development in Israel.

During the period between the 17th and 18th Congresses, the number of CPI members increased by 41 per cent, which is a considerable increase in the conditions of Israel. The majority of those joining the Party came from the ranks of the Young communist League; 21 per cent of the delegates were in the 31-40 age group, while 30 per cent were under the age of 30. Thus the majority of the Congress delegates were under 40; 23 per cent of the delegates had been less than five years in the Party, while 10 per cent of delegates had been members for more than 30 years; 76 per cent of the delegates were wage-earners.

Eleven new local branches of the Party had been opened since the preceding Congress, making 79 altogether.

By the time the 1976 Congress was held the Communists had a number of major political gains to their credit. In the elections to the Knesset in 1973 the Communist Party achieved a success, receiving 53,353 votes, 3.4 per cent of all votes, as against 38,827 votes, or 2.8 per cent, in 1969. The Party increased the number of its deputies in the Knesset from 3 to 4. At the time of the 17th Congress, there were Communist representatives in 18 local councils; now the Party is represented in 25.

In all elections to Histadrut and trade union institutions, held in this period, our Party increased its strength. In the NationalUnion of Building Workers, the increase was particularly big. In the elections held in November 1975, our list of candidates received 8.92 per cent of the total, as against 4.55 per cent in 1972.

The Party's extension of relations and widening of influence were expressed, *inter alia*, by the greetings conveyed to the Congress on behalf of numerous political and public organisations in Israel. The Congress aroused a wide [illegible] working people and the democratic circles. The presence a

he Congress of many delegations from Communist and Workers' parties, and particularly the delegation of the CPSU, was a powerful expression of proletarian internationalism and support for the policy and struggle of the CPI against occupation, and for peace, democracy, national and communal equality of rights, for the interests of workers. The Congress listened with a great sense of inspiration to the greetings that arrived from the Communist Parties of Arab countries, among them the greetings from the central Committee of the Jordanian Communist Party and the Palestinian Communist Organisation of the Occupied West Bank of the Jordan. The Congress of Israeli Communists proved to be a major milestone in the progress of the CPI's internationalist co-operation with Communist and Workers' parties.

Fair Settlement Programme

Special attention was paid at the Congress to the situation in the Middle East, which is today the hotbed of war that is most dangerous to world peace. The development in our region during the last four or five years has been characterised by a sharpening of the class struggle. The development in Arab countries was not uniform. On the one hand, there were further important achievements in the anti-imperialist struggle, the consolidation of national independence and carrying out of new progressive social changes in a number of Arab countries. On the other hand, there were retreats, especially in Egypt; and the imperialist pressure aimed against the independnce and revolutionary achievements of the Arab countries become more intense. Imperialism now increasingly utilises, along with its principle prop in the region—the State of Israel—the activities of reactionary and pro-imperialist Arab states, such as Saudi Arabia, Kuwait and the Federation of Arab Emirates.

American imperialism exploits the occupation of the Arab areas by Israel, the continuation of the Middle East crisis and the non-solution of the Palestinian question as a means of pressure and blackmail against the anti-imperialist Arab national movement. The American imperialists deliberately prolonged the crisis in our region and prevented the achievement of a comprehensive solution of the Israeli-Arab conflict and the Palestine question by partial agreements on the separation of forces, whose main purpose was to gain time in order to extract concessions from the Arab states for the benefit of imperialism, and in order to enable Israel to follow the accomplished-fact policy in the occupied territories. In recent years the US has poured enormous quantitites of sophisticated modern weapons into Israel, as well as into a number of other countries in the region in order to serve its objectives against the anti-imperialist national movement in Arab and African countries.

The CPI Congress deemed it necessary to stress that, on the whole, the Arab national movement today is also an important anti-imperialist factor, and the historical prospect is that the anti-imperialist and progressive social changes will expand and deepen, while the rightist, reactionary retreats will pass with the times, as they contradict the basic national interests of the Arab peoples.

Experience has proved, however, that not by collaboration with the American imperialists and participation in their intrigues, not by stepping up the arms race from which the American arms magnates gain superprofits, but by struggle against them and against their henchmen in the region will it be possible to put an end to the occupation and attain peace for the benefit of all the peoples and states.

The Congress delegates discussed at length ways to end the crisis. Th Communists pronounced a severe indictment against the ruling circles in Israe and the extreme right parties, which also support the general line of th government's policy of occupation and annexation and even demand that i should be given a sharper edge. We Israeli Communists accuse the government o being responsible for the outbreak of the October 1973 war. And if the danger o a fifth Isreali-Arab war exists—and it does—this is not the result of anyone' threatening Israel's existence, but of the Israeli ruling circles' desire for territoria expansion and their amazingly obstinate denial of the national rights of th Palestine Arab people, as well as their refusal to hold any negotiations with it competent, recognised and exclusive national representative—the Palestin Liberation Organisation.

It must be clear that whoever opposes talking with the PLO, opposes talkin with the Palestine Arab people, and whoever opposes talking with the Palestin Arab people, opposes peace and encourages a new war. The proposal made b he Israeli government at the UN Assembly in December 1976 to convene a Middle East peace conference in Geneva, but without the PLO, was just a lemagogical and cynical proposal. The Israeli Communists demanded th convening of the Middle East Peace Conference in Geneva without any delay under the auspices of the UN, with the Soviet Union and the USA as co chairmen, and with the participation of all sides involved on a basis of equality ncluding, of course, the Palestine Liberation Organisation. The Congres ormulated a just and realistic peace plan for the Middle East. The plan takes int account the rights of the peoples and the real correlation of forces in the world. I s based upon the implementation of the decisions of the Security Council and th JN General Assembly on the Middle East since 1967, and includes the followin nain points:

— Israel shall withdraw all her forces from the Arab areas seized by her in th une 1967 war. The June 4, 1967, borders shall be the peace frontiers.

— The right of the Palestine Arab people to self-determination and to establish n independent state alongside the State of Israel shall be respected.

— A just solution of the question of the Palestine refugees shall be ensured ir ccordance with the UN decisions, which recognise their right to choose between eturn to their homeland or receipt of compensation.

— The right of the State of Israel and the Arab states to sovereign existence erritorial integrity and development in conditions of peace and security shall be espected. Also, free navigation[1] shall be ensured for Israel, as for all the states.

— The peace conditions shall be anchored in agreement of a contractural nature.

In the conditions prevailing in the Middle East, and in view of the aftermath of nany years of quarrels and distrust—efficient international guarantee under the uspices of the United Nations and with the participation of the Soviet Union, he USA and other states, could do much to ensure a peace settlement.

On the other hand, our Party categorically opposes an Israeli-American military alliance, as proposed by certain Israeli and American circles. Such an lliance would not only mean abandonment of Israel's independence, but would lso serve as a source of tension, insecurity and imperilment of peace in the egion.

The Congress turned its attention to some particularly dangerous aspects in

official Israeli policy. Lately, the nuclear arms threat from certain Israeli quarters has intensified. The Israeli delegation to the latest UN General Assembly voted against the decision, which had been adopted almost unanimously, to turn the Middle East into a zone free from nuclear arms. Our 18th Congress sounded the severe warning that turning the Middle East into an area of the nuclear arms race would constitute the gravest criminal act against the Israeli people, the Arab peoples and world peace. The Communists demanded an end to the development of the atomic military option at the reactor in Demona. Israel should sign the nuclear non-proliferation treaty and agree to the decision of the UN General Assembly to turn the Middle East into a nuclear-free zone.

In this context, the Congress alerted public opinion in Israel against the infamous alliance with the racist regime in South Africa. This racist alliance has been tightened after the visit to Israel of South African Prime Minister Vorster in April 1976, and following the military and economic agreements signed between the two states, including an agreement on nuclear co-operation. The Congress denounced the Israeli government's diplomatic, economic and military ties with the murderous fascist junta in Chile and demanded their severance.

For the Broadest Peace Front

Analysing the internal situation in Israel, the Congress described it as more favourable for the maximum rallying of forces for the struggle against the occupation, for peace, democracy, equality of rights, and the workers' interests. In the past years the camp of partisans of peace has increased in Israel. At the same time, the political map indicates a turn to the right. This is expressed by the increased strength of the bloc of the extreme right parties of the big bourgeoisie—the "Likud", by the strengthening of rightist and hawkish influences within the ruling Labour Party and also within the National-Religious Party, and by the setting up of new political parties, headed by generals in reserve, which show clear anti-democratic tendencies and intensify the danger of fascism.

However, the rightists and bellicose reactionaries lack accord. The increasing contradiction between the policy of the government coalition parties and the extreme right, on the one hand, and the real development in the world and the region, on the other, as well as the failures of the prevailing policy in all spheres of social life, have caused fermentation, struggles and even splits within the government coalition parties, as well as within the "Likud". The resignation of the Rabin government and the postponement of the Knesset elections to May 1977 are clear evidence of the crisis of the official Israeli policy and the public's distrust of that policy.

The root of the crisis is very deep. This is not just a government crisis, but the crisis of the regime in Israel. The broad public—the workers and all toilers, the intelligentsia, the youth and the medium strata—are dissatisfied with the regime. The economic and social situation is miserable. Prices soar from day to day. Taxes are intolerably heavy. The public services (health, education, welfare, housing, culture, etc.) are being reduced. In 1976 the military expenditures (including repayment of debts, principal and interests, for the arms purchased in previous years) came to two-thirds of the entire state budget. People fear of a further war, they feel confusion and even despair at the situation.

The extreme right wishes to exploit this situation in order to seize power in the

forthcoming elections. This is a concrete danger for the first time in the history of the State of Israel. The policy of occupation has paved, and is paving, the road to power for the fascist forces in Israel.

The CPI has alerted the working class, all the toilers and popular masses, to this danger and pointed out that the best way of blocking the path to power for the extreme right would be a change of official Israeli policy in the direction of peace and the rallying of all anti-fascist forces.

The CPI Congress clearly indicated the real choice facing the people: either a just and stable peace or another war, which is liable to be bloodier than the preceding ones. Nobody doubts the hoplessness of the reactionary aspiration of the government to continue the no peace—no war situation in order to perpetuate the occupation and liquidate the national rights of the Palestine Arab people. The Communists stressed that the allegation of the annexationists that peace is a trap for Israel, is a lie. We said: peace in the Middle East is a sheet anchor for Israel, it is in the interests of all peoples in the region, in the interests of universal security.

Our Party has made great efforts to rally the forces of peace and political realism in Israel in a broad peace front, irrespective of ideological views and party affiliation. Joint mass actions of peace forces have been held. Till this day, however, the main weakness of the peace forces is their lack of unity. If they were united, they could be a concrete alternative to the policy of war and annexations pursued by the government and the extreme right.

The Communist Party proposed—for the first time—to draw up a list of candidates for the Knesset elections in 1977 from the front of the forces of democracy and peace. Its task is to ward off the furious drive of the rightist forces to power, to bring about a change of the government's policy, to struggle on a broader scale for preventing a new war, for attaining peace, defending the democratic rights, and workers' rights, for equality of rights of the Arab population in Israel and eliminating the discrimination against the Jews of Afro-Asian descent. The Congress has also clarified the Communist standpoint with regard to the inter-relation between the struggle for unity of action and the ideological struggle.

Speaking about the ideological aspect, it must he stressed that the CPI, adhering to its principled positions, is consistently unmasking the ideology and practice of Zionism, which expresses the interests of the big Jewish bourgeoisie and contradicts the interests of the toilers, the true interests of the Israeli people and the general cause of progress and socialism.[2] This activity is associated with our struggle against the falsifiers of the teachings of Marxism-Leninism, against the falsifiers of the character of the socialist regime in the Soviet Union and in other socialist states. We are making a special effort to fight all kinds of anti-Sovietism, which seeks to undermine the faith of the workers and the youth in the socialist ideal and serves the class enemy.

There is no contradiction between the ideological struggle and the struggle for unanimity in concrete questions on a progressive basis. Divergencies of views must not prevent the unity of all the forces in the vital struggle for peace, democracy and workers' rights. And the struggle for unity of action must not prevent ideological and political discussion and the bringing out of differences on various issues.

The decisive division in today's political struggle in Israel is not between

Communists and the realistically-minded Zionist elements and groups,[3] but a class division; and a political one, between workers and capitalists, between forces of peace and forces of war and annexation, between democratic forces and forces leading to fascism. There are Zionists who take up a correct and realistic position on concrete political or social issues. Hence the possibility of the establishment of a peace front, a democratic front, and a united workers' front.

Under the present circumstances, the strategic objective of the progressive struggle in Israel is putting an end to the occupation and the achievement of peace. The peace front in Israel should comprise all those who are prepared to struggle against the occupation, against the prevailing policy, and for a just and stable peace. The front can and must be very broad. It must unite organisations and individuals, Jews and Arabs, people of different ideological views—Communist, Zionist, religious—all who support a just and real peace.

Equal Rights for Arabs and Jews

In recent years the government's policy of discrimination and national oppression against the Arab population in Israel has sharpened. Supported by the Jewish democratic forces, the Arabs have been stepping up the struggle against oppression and for national equality. In 1975, and particularly in 1976, the struggle reached a new peak. It is only logical that the problems of the Arab population were in the focus of attention at the 18th Congress.

The Communists categorically rejected the government's fundamental Zionist concepts on the Arab minority status, and the ruling circles' views on the character of the State of Israel. The Congress absolutely repudiated the declaration of Prime Minister Rabin, according to which the State of Israel is a pure Jewish, Zionist state, and that, therefore, the national rights of tbe Arab population there could not be recognised as a national minority.

The State of Israel is indeed a Jewish state, as it expresses the right of the Jewish people in Israel to self-determination. This right was recognised, together with the right of the Palestine Arab people to self-determination and state independence, in the decision of the UN General Assembly of November 29, 1947. This has nothing to do with the reactionary and metaphysical Zionist concept of the alleged existence of a world Jewish nation. The reference is to the Jewish people who inhabit this country, Israel.

However, Israel is not only a Jewish state, but a state with a substantial Arab national minority which is part of the Arab people of Palestine. The official Zionist positions, which deny national rights to the Arab population in Israel, are intolerable, and only prove the racist character of Zionist concepts.

The forum of Israeli Communists drew up a highly important programme for the civil and national equality of rights of the Arab national minority in Israel. On the basis of this programme we will mobilise the Arab population in Israel to the struggle, together with the Jewish democratic forces. Today this struggle is against the occupation of the Arab areas seized in 1967 and for the right of the Palestine Arab people to establish its own independent state alongside the state of Israel, for a just and stable peace for the benefit of all the peoples and states.

The 18th Congress has given the Party a strong ideological and political weapon, a weapon which was made to be used in the anti-imperialist and class struggles in Israel and elsewhere in the region, for fresh victories and successes. This is facilitated by the international situation, which reveals new opportunities

for greater unity of the forces of peace, national liberation, democracy, social progress and socialism.

[1]Along international waterways (the Suez Canal, for instance).—*Ed.*

[2]See J. Pittman and Z. Karkabi, "The True Face of Zionism", *WMR*, March 1977.—*Ed.*

[3]See M. Vilner, "The Struggle Against Zionism is a Class Struggle", *WMR*, January 1976.—*Ed*

The Revolution's Most Militant Political Force

The third anniversary of the revolutionary overthrow of the fascist dictatorship in Portugal will be celebrated on April 25. The Portuguese Communist Party, which is consistently and firmly defending its positions in the struggle for democratic social reforms and socialist development, has won respect and political authority among the working people. The 8th Party Congress set out the tremendous tasks facing Portuguese Communists in the sphere of mass political work and building up the Party, that is to say, improving the Party's organisational structure, training and educating new cadres and improving the forms and methods of guiding the masses.

The *WMR* has asked some prominent Party people to tell readers about the work being done in this direction, the Party's experience and the problems it faces.

Party Organisational Work should be Adequate to the New Tasks

OCTAVIO PATO

member of Secretariat and CC Political Commission, CP Portugal

OUR political opponents have never succeeded in belittling either the Party's role in national affairs or the people's revolutionary gains. And the hostile campaign started by counter-revolutionary circles in connection with the Party's recent 8th Congress has also failed.

Reactionaries and anti-Communists of every hue first predicted that the Congress would pass unnoticed because, they claimed, the Party's programme and political line were far from reality and "divorced" from the working people's interests. Reactionary hopes, however, were buried long before the Congress was convened. The Central Committee's theses were greeted with attention and interest by the broad masses, who approved of the document's appraisal of the struggle that culminated in the overthrow of the fascist regime, and of the revolutionary gains made by the people—nationalisation, the agrarian reform and worker control. The Communist Party's analysis of the domestic situation, of the tasks facing the workers and all toiling people, and of the broad horizons revealed to them was likewise approved by the people. The response to the Congress in Portugal and abroad, and the close attention it received from local and foreign observers confirmed the Portuguese Communist Party's vanguard role in all areas of national life.[1]

Equally bankrupt were reactionary predictions of a split and disagreements at the Congress. Our opponents were generous with forecasts and even "advice". Some maintained that Communist strategy had failed, while others insisted that the Communist Party was "excessively" revolutionary, that it was going through a crisis and was now ripe for "Europeanisation", which in the jargon of opponents of socialism means weakening, if not revision, of the Party's class positions and revolutionary line. Still others went so far as to "recommend" that the Party replace its General Secretary.

Today, we, Portuguese Communists, can confidently say that this Congress will go down in Portuguese history as an outstanding event and a wonderful success for the Communists. It demonstrated that our Party is the most organised, the most firmly oriented and militant political force in the country. The Communist Party is still the only political party in Portugal which has not experienced any internal political contradictions in the course of the revolutionary process. The results of the 8th Congress and the first few months of fulfilment of its decisions have shown that the CP Portugal has not only preserved, but is strengthening its unity and rallying closely round the Central Committee headed by Alvaro Cunhal.

Even the reactionaries have been forced to acknowledge Communist fidelity to an accepted political line, principled irreconcilability in relation to the enemies of social progress, and firmness in developing revolutionary democracy and defence of the working people's interests. The Communist Party is the conscious vanguard of the working class; it is a powerful organisation uniting 115,000 like-minded people.

However, there is no reason for complacency. Our pride in our party's growing influence does not blind us to our weaknesses and shortcomings.

Now that the 8th Congress is over, Portuguese Communists are faced with the big and complex task of fulfilling its decisions. The entire Party, from the Central Committee to the primary organisations, must be up to the political demands of the day. This means, first, that to guide the revolutionary transformation of society the Party must actively influence events and not just trail along in their wake. We must foresee events and correctly analyse the situation in the country, and this, in turn, requires greater theoretical research. Secondly, the scope, variety and complexity of the problems facing our Party require improvement of its organisational structure.

On the whole, of course, the work of the Central Committee and the leading Party organs in large regions is adequate to present demands, to the tasks of developing the revolutionary process. The results, however, are being achieved by overstraining the comrades working in these organs. At the same time there are groups even in the organisational structure of the Central Committee and the executive bodies who work is not sufficiently effective. In such cases new mechanisms of Party guidance must be set up or the existing ones improved.

On the eve of the 8th Congress, besides the Central Committee and its executive organs—the Political commission and Secretariat—we had a central organisational commission, a trade union commission, an information and propaganda department and an international department.

Several specialised commissions, operating on a national scale, were set up just before the Congress. These included the agrarian reform and peasant commissions. Our experience has shown that such organisational methods are

fully justified and the Congress decided to continue the practice of setting up such commissions. It is apparent today that we will need them, in the womens' movement, for example in local government, in the education and health services, among the small merchants and employers, intellectuals and artists, and even among the Young Pioneers, who for some time now have been requesting that the Central Committee permit them the "right of association".

Personnel and resources must also be found to broaden our ideological work. The Congress reviewed the work of our newspaper *Avante!* and the information and propaganda department which, the Congress found must improve and extend their work.

There is an urgent need to form a commission on cadres, if only with limited functions, in order to relieve the CC Secretariat. Certain organisational measures are needed to help Party members who have been elected to various government bodies.

We agree that in order to improve the work of regional Party organisations they should likewise form specialised commissions in their many areas of activity.

Since the 8th Congress, greater attention has been paid at the regional and national levels to working people's commissions functioning at nationalised enterprises or those that are under worker control.

These organisational measures are meant to gradually increase the initiative and independence of the middle and lower levels of Party leadership. Such decentralisation is absolutely necessary, for in present conditions the leading regional and national organs are no longer able to guide and control all sectors of Party work themselves as was the case in underground conditions.

However, the decentralisation measures and the formation of specialised organs in the framework of a unified system should not be confused with proposals to erect what are called fully independent, parallel structures, or structures indirectly dependent on the leading Party organs. Such proposals would tend to disrupt unified leadership and undermine the principles of democratic centralism. We are careful not to make such mistakes, particularly because while striving for decentralisation in some areas, we must work for centralisation in others.

The Party believes the Central Committee's leading role should be enhanced. With this in mind the 8th Congress expanded the CC membership, a move which will undoubtedly improve conditions, style and methods of work. But, we shall stand by the golden rule that workers and other categories of working people should comprise an absolute majority on the Central Committee. Unlike the minister of the present government and a leader of the Socialist Party, Dr. Campinos, who declared at his party's last congress that the working class is an abstract concept, we, remaining true to Marxist-Leninist principles, see it clearly as concrete reality, and believe it to be the most consistent and revolutionary class with the greatest interest in liquidating capitalist exploitation and building a classless, socialist society.

We are firmly convinced that collective methods of leadership and developing inner-Party democracy in all organisations on the principles of democratic centralism, is the basic condition for the growth of our Party's strength and its political authority and influence among the people.

Questions Pertaining to Cadres Policy

JOSE VITORIANO
member CC Political Commission

SINCE emerging from the underground and in the conditions of the revolutionary-democratic regime, our Party has had much broader opportunities for working among the population. The struggle to defend the people's gains from reactionary intrigues, to mobilise the revolutionary initiative of the masses and guide it along socialist lines, confronts us with ever new problems of both a local and national character. Besides having to analyse them and determine our position, which must conform with a unified political line, it is necessary to inform all Party organisations, the membership and all working people of our decisions and instructions and ensure their correct fulfilment.

The problem of cadres, the people responsible for carrying out the numerous and difficult tasks that life places before us, requires our undivided and careful attention. Our functionaries must be ideologically staunch Party workers, qualified to deal with ideological, propaganda and organisational problems, capable of working in the Party apparatus itself and among the people, political activists both locally and on a national level.

There are many exprienced people in the Party today, staunch Marxists-Leninists, devoted to the cause of the revolution and socialism. Many were schooled in the fight against the fascist dictatorship, in condtions of the underground. Thousands of others have shown themselves to be able political workers, organisers and propagandists in the post-April 25 period, in the struggle for democracy, the agrarian reform, nationalisation and worker-control. Taken together, they form a reliable nucleus of the Party's theoretical, political and organisational forces.

However, despite the fact that in these three years after the revolution, more Party functionaries have been trained than in all the preceding decades of the Party's history, the need for them remains acute. Party membership has outstripped the training of experienced Party workers with the result that certain areas of our Party's organisational structure have been denuded. For example, of the 115,000 Party members. approximately 35,000 still play a minor part in day-to-day political activities. This is because of the acute shortage of middle-level organisers capable of keeping the local Party organisations closer in close contact with the higher Party organs.

The number of experienced Party workers in some district organisations falls far short of their needs. In one such organisation with a membership in the vicinity of 3,000, there are only 5 full-time Party functionaries and each has twice as many members to work with as the average for the country.

It is not our intention to replace all volunteer Party workers with professional cadres, but there must be a certain minimum.

Of course, we must prepare our own cadres, promoting the most capable, especially the youth, to executive and other responsible posts, doing this boldly, possibly with a certain risk and not fearing mistakes. In the final analysis, this approach should justify itself.

But we must be self-critical enough to admit that not always is this done as well as it should be. Talented organisers are not easily found. A closer acquaintance with local organisations can bring them to light. But, at times we do not know

these organisations, or have a superficial knowledge of them, and so are not able to discern talented persons among the membership.

The Party is interested in providing its experienced workers with the necessary political, theoretical and special knowledge. This is achieved through the Party system of special monthly or weekly courses, which have been attended by about a 1,000 Party members. Several fraternal parties have helped us greatly in this.

Besides the central CP organs, the district and local bodies are likewise responsible for training cadres. Most have their own shorter courses, usually working on Saturdays over a period of several weeks. The local Party organs make wide use of lectures, talks and other forms of political education.

All these methods have proved effective and we intend using them more extensively. At the same time we plan to supplement these courses with practical instructions and by promoting active participation in the daily political struggle.

In the school of revolution, Party workers broaden their political and ideological outlook and capabilities and rid themselves of many shortcomings. However, we must not forget that in complicated situations new members may be taken aback by the difficulties and it is here that they will need help and support. Trust, attention, respect and a comradely concern for young Party workers are essential to a correct cadres policy and one of the conditions for its success.

We believe that regular participation in the work of Party organs and in collective discussions and approval of decisions is an effective method of educating cadres and helping them to improve their leadership qualifications. It also leads to a broader and more comprehensive appraisal of one's work. Besides, such common efforts teach cadres to turn to collective experience in times of difficulty, to constructive criticism and self-criticism which helps Party members discover and correct shortcomings and mistakes.

At times, there may be extremes in cadres policy, when some individuals divide Party functionaries into two groups—those who joined the Party before April 25 and those who joined after. We are decidedly against such a purely formalistic approach. Today, everyone is a part of the united and indivisible Communist Party, whose members enjoy equal rights and responsibilities. An experienced Party worker is judged not only by membership seniority, but also by revolutionary services efficiency and, dedication to the Party cause. An objective and friendly attitude to people, the ability to form a correct idea of their qualities, merits and mistakes, are imperative to a correct cadres policy.

Organs of Popular Initiative

JAIME SERRA
member of CC Political Commission

LAST December's elections to the local organs of popular government confirmed the Party's tremendous influence and respect among the working people and its role as a mass party. The support given the Party by voters shows that the CP Programme, providing a socialist alternative, reflects the working people's interests. The election returns, however, were in large measure the result of the Party's daily and systematic political and organisational work among the population, its participation in and guidance of the activities of various public organisations.

In the early stages of the revolution, many Party members able organisers with

experience in the underground struggle, were promoted to administrative posts in local government, where they defended the working people's interests against attacks by reaction and countered the resistance of the central administration to popular initiative. And they won public prestige and respect by their understanding of the people's needs and their determination to achieve the goals of the revolution.

The elections also showed that in order to increase Party influence among the people and to guide the local organs of government effectively one has to be active in the local mass organisations. These organisations were created on popular initiative and unite the workers of a given factory (for example, working people's commissions), the population of a city neighbourhood or a village residential commissions). Experience has shown that in the manifold activities of these commissions problems arise requiring joint efforts on more than just a local scale. This has led to the emergence of people's assemblies in parishes, regions and districts. During the last elections to the parish and municipal assemblies and the municipalities these organisations played a big role in nominating candidates from the United People Election Front created on our Party's initiative. It was these commissions and assemblies that nominated, discussed and approved the United People candidates and this went a long way in helping to elect thousands of Communists and persons with firm revolutionary-democratic convictions to local government.

Our Party has accumulated a good deal of experience in working in mass organisations representative of various democratic segments of the working population and embodying their will and initiative. The 8th Party Congress theses state "The *primary, unitary organisations,* and those, that after their renewal have preserved the traditional forms that appeared during the fasicist dictatorship, such as the *working people's commissions,* and those that reappeared after April 25 as *commissions of the local population and popular assemblies,* are a most important expression of the popular movement and one of the conditions for its development".

The April 25 revolution has changed all aspects of public life in Portugal, including these organisations. The working people's commissions at enterprises, for example, now unite workers not only for better working and living conditions, as they did in fascist times. Nationalisation and the introduction of worker control have made their work broader and more intricate and these commissions also play a constructive role in the development of their forms of the popular movement. They have provided models for the formation of urban and village residential commissions and popular assemblies. It is no accident that these forms have flourished in the more industrialised areas of the country with long-standing revolutionary traditions such as the regions of Greater Lisbon, the Margem Sul do Tejo, and in the North, in the zone better known as Grande Porto. Nor is it accidental that in these zones the unitary organisations were most resistant to the revolutionary ebb connected with the events of November 25, 1975.[2]

There is one more significant aspect in the development of such forms of uniting the working people. This is the dual influence exerted upon them by the Armed Forces movement. On the one hand the democratic forces in the army actively supported the development of popular initiatives and the formation of primary popular organisations. On the other hand, there were functionaries in

the Armed Forces Movement who planned to establish their control of these organisations and interfere in their internal affairs. This had obviously negative consequences because various forms of popular initiative will develop and flourish only if the civil and military authorities respect their autonomous nature.

The success of the December 12 elections, the many progressive candidates voted into office on the United People ticket will undoubtedly help to liven up the local popular organisations and consolidate their co-operation with the democratically elected government organs.

Another point worth mentioning is that of the unitary organisations. These organisations do not figure in the legally, defined structure of Portuguese society, nor are they provided for in the Constitution. Conditions for their recognition have become more favourable, however, in view of the formation of municipal councils. "The municipal council," says Article 253 of the Constitution, "is a consultative organ of the municipality; the law defines its composition in such a manner as to guarantee adequate representation of economic, social, cultural and professional organisations existing in the corresponding area". This means that practically all public orgaisations can have a seat on the municpal councils. In other words, the Constitution grants legality to commissions at place of residence. As for the asemblies, these effective weapons in defending working peoples' interests and mobilising the population for building the new democratic society, they have gained sufficient strength to be accepted as institutions.

The Communist Party of Portugal has strong positions in these organs of popular initiative and is turning them into a reliable bastion for defending and consolidating the Portuguese peoples' revolutionary gains. For example, the charter of the popular assembly in the Almada district speaks of developing the revolutionary process, defending the existing social transformations, and also "encouraging, stimulating and mobilising the working people of the district to build socialism". Although not all the primary, unitary organisations compare with the assembly of the Almade workers' district in the development of their conscious revolutionary political platform, on the whole they certainly play a big part in the democratic process as a school for the mass training of organisers and educating the masses in a revolutionary and creative spirit.

[1]For more information see A. Cunhal, "Results and Prospects of the Portuguese Revolution", *WMR*, January 1977.

[2]On that day there was unco-ordinated action by individual military units who fell under the influence of leftist elements. Reaction took advantage of this to launch a wide political campaign against progressive, revolutionary-democratic organisations and movements.

The Communist Party of Denmark After its Congress: Confidence and Optimism

JORN CHRISTENSEN

Secretary, Central Committee, Communist Party of Denmark

DEVELOPMENTS since the 25th Communist Party Congress (September 1976) have fully confirmed its analysis of the crisis of capitalist society, the urgency of the tasks facing the Danish Communists and their demands for a change of government policy.

The Congress was expressive of the rise in Party activity. After a wide-ranging democratic discussion, it adopted the Party's new Programme directed against the domination of big capital and, with the Party now strengthened, was able to set new goals.

The Danish Communists have to work in a complicated situation. The Social-Democrat government's policy of deals with the Right-wing parties has led to the gradual dismantling of all the social gains of the working class. The government has introduced new measures to help state-monopoly capital find a way out of the crisis. These measures, which have increased unemployment and depressed real wages, bear out the assessment of the situation given by the congress: "Danish society is in the throes of a crisis caused by the absence of planning in the capitalist system. Big capital is bent on depressing the working people's standard of living and using for this purpose its legislative power and also the supra-national Common Market agencies. The Social-Democrat government has taken on the job of implementing that policy and is making overtures to the parties that speak for big capital. Its policy is not resolving the crisis but worsening it: massive unemployment, the offensive against the working people's democratic rights, reduction of social expenditure, high prices and errosion of the education system, which is fraught with such ruinous consequences for the young generation".

The government has not kept its promise to bring the country economic stability. The August agreement between the Social-Democrats and a number of bourgeois parties on economic and currency problems, as a result of which social expenditure was further cut, has not led to political stability. Increasing pressure by the labour movement throughout the country, expressed also in strikes by workers with no trade-union traditions, particularly in the oil and dairy industries, precipitated another political and parliamentary crisis in November and December.

There has been a new assault on the working class. The 1973 collective agreements were prolonged in 1975 for a two-year period by legislative act, and as a result of the subsequent compromise with the right-wing parties, wage increases were restricted to two per cent in preparation for the new round of collective bargaining in 1977. Even the right-wing Social-Democrat leaders of the Central Trade Union Federation found themselves compelled to disavow these new measures. And yet they were considered insufficient, and in December,

yielding to pressure by the bourgeois parties, a new deal was rigged up in parliament, which factually imposed a three-month freeze on any wage increases. This means that parallel with the existing system of labour legislation and arbitration, with its multitude of juridical procedures, which effectively curtails the right to strike, the new law forbids the working class, albeit temporarily, to fight for higher wages.

This law was followed by another one, on freezing prices. From the very outset everyone knew that this was a sheer illusion because there is no way of controlling prices. Still another law provides for a three-month rent freeze. In other words, the two per cent wage-increase ceiling actually hamstrings the workers, unless they are able to force the government to change its policy. In other areas, such as prices and rents, where the working class does not exert a powerful influence, free market laws will again begin to operate. In present-day capitalist conditions this will mean more profit for big capital.

It need hardly be said that this policy is totally unacceptable to the working class, which is bearing the main burden of the capitalist crisis, with its right to fight for better conditions being cut away piece by piece. This explains the new strike wave and other actions by the working people. A leading capitalist newspaper, reporting that there were over 1,000 strikes in 1976 (as against 755 in 1975) remarked that "this number is a record for the 70s". But there were also 240 political strikes in protest against the parliamentary deal which limited wage rises to two per cent, and about 25 strikes of solidarity with the workers of the royal porcelain factory who were out for twelve weeks in the summer of 1976.

These figures indicate that last year's expectations of a more acceptable policy by the Social-Democrat government have given way to greater determination by the workers and their organisations more actively to fight for their interests. And mindful of this mood of the workers, the big trade unions, all of them under Social-Democrat influence, had no choice but to come out against the government onslaught on living standards. This is evidence of the wide contradictions between the trade union movement and the Social-Democrats. These contradictions can no longer be played down or brushed aside, and they cannot be resolved by the old customary methods, such as "dialogue" or "negotiations". For today the workers' demand, more persistently and energetically than ever, measures that would lead to a real improvement of their economic and social conditions.

The situation fully corroborates the formulation of the immediate tasks of the working class given in the new Party Programme: "Unity and organisation are necessary methods of working class struggle. For only in this way can the majority of the nation, whose labour ensures the progress of society, create a counterforce opposing those who rule over society".

But the creation of such a counterforce is the duty not only of the Communists. The period discussed in this article saw one of the biggest trade union conferences ever held in Denmark. It was convened not on the initiative of the Central Trade Union Federation, but by the Co-ordinating committee of Copenhagen trade unions, which over the past few years has shown what the Danish trade union movement should be like: viable, active and steadily building up its influence in society. The conference was attended by more than 1,000 delegates elected by trade unions throughout the country and representing different political trends. It formulated the following demands: jobs for everyone; higher purchasing

power of wages; re-distribution of the tax burden; control of the movement of capital; nationalisation of banking, insurance, energy, and the pharmaceutical industry. It called on the workers to "demand that the Social Democrats end their co-operation with the bourgeois parties and join with other workers' parties in upholding the interests of labour".

The conference formulated the following basic demands for the forthcoming collective bargaining negotiations: 35 crowns an hour, a 35 hour workweek, a 35 day annual paid holiday.

An end to unemployment and more jobs is a basic demand of all Danish workers. But unemployment enables the ruling classes to exert pressure on the workers; that, in fact, is part of their economic policy. And that is why the repeated assurances of the parliamentary majority of its desire and readiness to solve this crucial problem have remained just promises. The repeated pledges to provide "work for many", "take off the edge of unemployment", etc., have remained hollow words. In fact, the results have been just the opposite: unemployment has become permanent despite all the government's promises to "improve the situation on the labour market". More, the latest available data show that unemployment now stands at 170,000 and that the tendency is towards further increases.

Unemployment affects practically all sections of the population, but the youth are the hardest hit. Education opportunities are restricted by the lack of places in schools and colleges resulting from cuts in social expenditure. On leaving school thousands of young people have but one choice, join the unemployed army. According to recent figures, about one-quarter of all unemployed are under the age of 25. The situation is further aggravated by the constant attacks on the rights and interests of all working people, launched by the right-wing parties which have now been joined by the Social-Democrats. The position of the aged and invalids is rapidly deteriorating. There is less money available also for child care.

Furthermore, the ruling circles are preparing a fresh offensive against the working class and the most helpless part of the population (pensioners, etc.). These plans are being countered primarily by the Communists, who are mobilising the working people for a fight to remove the causes and consequences of the crisis.

The crisis is having a powerful impact also on parties which, albeit inconsistently, champion working class interests. The Socialist People's Party, a right-wing breakaway from the Communist Party, formed in 1959, is in a state of deep crisis that threatens its very existence. Conceived as an "alternative" and "catalyst" standing midway between the Social Democrats and the Communists, it is torn by discord over policy principles and organisational structure. On the one hand, there is the ineffectual struggle to maintain its image of a socialist party, while on the other there is a conflict over who should determine its policy, the parliamentary group or the elected leadership. There have been many conferences in an attempt to reconcile the two factions, declarations which are violated even before they are published, attempts to undermine the position of the majority of the party's parliamentary group. In the sixties, in the days of the apparent stabilisation of capitalism, the party managed to increase its membership; now it cannot even maintain its electoral support. It has now come to realise that it does not have a real ideological basis, something the Communists were the first to point out. As things stand today, there is a clear

threat to the survival of this party as an [illegible] standing to the left of the Social-Democrats. Its activity more and more clearly reveals its reformist tendencies, which differ from the traditional reformism of the Social-Democrats in words but very little in deeds.

The evolution of the Left Socialist Party is another story of endless discord and bickering due, on the one hand, to the accumulation of "ultra-left" views, and, on the other, to the absence of political and ideological principles that would go beyond simple exposure of some of the defects of capitalism and would be directed against the system as a whole.

Common to both of these parties is their anti-Communist prejudices which hamper both their development and their influence in the working class and its trade union organisations.

More than ever before, the situation requires a strong and viable Communist Party. And the Danish Communists have scored fresh successes by their policy of united action of all workers and democratic forces which, as our Congress has stated, is the alternative to the dominance of big capital. These successes can be seen, in particular, in the Party's growing influence among the workers and in various youth organisations, also in the practical results of our work to explain the Communist view. Party membership has grown since the last Congress to more than 10,000, and the tendency is for continued growth. The circulation of our newspaper, *Land og Folk,* and of our theoretical journal, *Tiden,* has increased. The growing popularity of our paper is evidenced, in particular, by the success of its financial support campaign: in five weeks Party members and supporters contributed nearly three million crowns to the paper's fund.

The February parliamentary elections did not significantly alter the Social-Democrats' class collaboration policy. The crisis difficulties and problems remain unsolved, and there is still greater need for powerful mass pressure to prevent a shift to the right and force the government to change its policy.

Despite the virulent anti-communist campaign, our Party has kept its seven seats in the Folketing. The election results reaffirmed anew the correctness of the 25th Congress policy of intensifying the class struggle against big capital and raising the activity of Party members in industry.

The Party's growing influence, its role in parliament and in many municipal councils, necessitates new forms of political struggle and a wider scope of party activity. The programme approved by our 25th Congress creatively applies Marxism-Leninism in Danish conditions. And taking the programme as our basis, we are working to enhance the role of Communists in society. Accordingly, propaganda of the programme is a priority task for all Party organisations.

There are also other tasks to be accomplished. Having analysed the results of the Congress, the Central Committee outlined a number of measures to translate its decisions into practice. This entails, first, more intensive ideological training of Party members and supporters, for which purpose we are establishing a Central Party School. Other goals are: increasing the circulation of the Party press; more intensive Party recruitment to double the membership by the next Congress; timely preparation for the 1978 municipal elections. We feel sure that all these tasks will be effectively carried out.

We are optimistic about the future. But we realise that accomplishment of these tasks will present certain problems and make new demands on our Party. But we shall solve these problems in accordance with our Programme, working

The Struggle of the Sudanese Communists

IBRAHIM ZAKARIA
CC member, Sudanese Communist Party

LAST year the Communists and all progressives of our country celebrated the 30th anniversary of the Sudanese Communist Party. On August 16, 1946, advanced representatives of a young working class and revolutionary intellectuals founded the Sudanese National Liberation Movement, which later became the SCP.

The rise of an independent political organisation of the working class adhering to the Marxist-Leninist world outlook was a a great historic significance and left a deep imprint on the anti-colonial movement in the Sudan. As soon as it came into being, the SCP set out to bring the working people into the fight against British colonialism, for national independence, and to impart an explicitly social character to this fight. Along with the people, it flatly rejected the false choice which the traditional parties tried to impose, alleging that there were only two alternatives for the Sudan: independence "under the Egyptian crown" (known as Nile Valley Unity), and entry into the British Commonwealth of Nations. The SCP was the only party to advance a consistent political programme of anti-colonial struggle, which ended in winning national independence early in1956.

The SCP has invariably attached vast importance to the formation of mass labour unions, bearing in mind the social and economic situation in the country and the political structure, that had taken shape after World War II. This structure, represented by parties founded at that time, was not based on class principles but on communal and tribal divisions.

The very existence of a growing trade union movement tended to undermine conservative communal and tribal institutions. The masses became aware of their interests and increasingly based their activity on political and economic principles. Led by the SCP, the working class, though relatively small, emerged as a major social and political factor in the late forties and early fifties. We have now good reason to say that our country has an organised movement of the working class, which in turn, has a political vanguard.

The SCP has always done its best to meet the requirements of the revolutionary movement of the masses. Mention should be made, however, of the negative effect of difficulties that arose in the Party leadership at various stages. Naturally, they told on the work of the Party as a whole. This was so mainly in the period following the winning of independence, when the Sudanese bourgeoisie, formerly a party to the anti-colonial front, became one of the forces ruling the country. It inclined towards conciliation with imperialism and tried to disrupt the working-class movement from within. That was when the first opportunist groups appeared in the trade unions, which they wanted to turn into organisations trailing behind the bourgeoisie. The bourgeoisie pursued similar aims in regard to the student movement and peasant unions.

The Party's work in those conditions was hampered, in particular, by the lack of a clear-cut strategy. The situation improved as a result of the Third SCP

Congress (Fegruary 1956), which adopted a programme formulating the key tasks of the revolutionary movement after the winning of political independence and envisaging non-capitalist development. The new tasks induced the Party to make appropriate changes in its working methods, specifically those of keeping in touch with the masses and leading them. The programme was evidence of a higher level of political and ideological work in the Party and the revolutionary movement as a whole. This was particularly important in view of the intensifying confrontation between democratic forces, which strove to use political independence as a means of bringing about progressive social and economic changes, on the one hand, and a bourgeois and feudal coalition intent on monopolising political activity and subordinating it to its interests, as well as to the interests of imperialist neocolonialists, on the other. The problems of social and economic development are still the pivot of the political struggle in the Sudan, for the manner in which they are solved will largely determine the outlook for setting up a national economy and ridding the country of neocolonial dependence.

When, in January 1956, the national liberation movement culminated in declaring the Sudan a sovereign state, ours was an exceedingly backward country with an economy largely controlled by foreign capital. The state protected "traditional" social structures and relations which doomed the mass of the people to poverty, ignorance and suffering. The Third SCP Congress called for non-capitalist development as the best way of ending the country's lag. But the propertied classes and strata that had come to power led the country along a capitalist road. The past twenty years have revealed the inability of this policy to ensure economic growth and national progress. Indeed, it has strengthened relations based on exploitation at home and resulted in still greater dependence abroad, the exhaustion of economic resources and a slowing down of social and economic development.

The objective inability of the ruling bourgeoisie and feudal landowners to proceed to an effective solution of the problems that arose after the declaration of independence, popular unrest, and the steadily growing influence of revolutionary elements, especially of the SCP, in the mass movement, produced an acute political crisis in the country that in 1958 prompted the ruling classes to transfer power to a military regime under General Abbud. Six years of military dictatorship brought out the disastrous role which the top bureaucracy, both civilian and military, plays in the state. The bureaucracy, which enjoyed definite privileges and completely disregarded the vital intererests of the overwhelming majority of the people, did nothing but enrich itself and dragged the country deeper and deeper into the meshes of economic and political dependence on imperialism. Hence one of the most important tasks of the revolutionary democratic movement is to eliminate the pro-colonialist bureaucracy, democratise the state and assign leading posts to patriots.

In October 1964, a general political strike put an end to General Abbud's regime. The great progressive significance of this event is beyond question. However, certain factors gave its results a limited character and barred the way to the fulfilment of national democratic tasks. The military dictatorship was succeeded by a civilian dictatorship of semi-feudal and bourgeois elements professing to seek a return to "parliamentary democracy".

These factors include, first of all, the general state and trend of the popular

movement at the time. The movement restricted its objectives in the main to the overthrow of the military dictatorship, which it did not regard as merely a special instrument of maintaining a conservative social class system. The people's political consciousness had not yet risen to a genuinely revolutionary understanding of the meaning of the military dictatorship's fall or of the opportunities this could provide.

Secondly, brutal persecution of the SCP and other progressive forces led to a certain swing of the popular movement to the right. In particular, the policy of repression and of removing Communists and democrats from the trade unions inevitably affected the strength, organisation and militancy of the working class. As a result, the general political strike was not led by the working class but by the petty bourgeoisie, which could not express the people's interests firmly and consistently, as experience showed. This enabled the rightists after October 1964 to prevent a deepening of the revolutionary process.

Thirdly, the SCP had not prepared adequately for the new situation, although as early as the summer of 1961, it made a correct forecast of its main features. By the time the military dictatorship was brought down, the Party had been weakened by the impact of left extremist ideas. It wasted much energy combating division within its ranks.

Fourthly, the military dictatorship was eliminated at a time when the army was somewhat passive politically. Although the army showed certain dissatisfaction with General Abbud's rule, the sentiment was not widespread enough for the army or part of it to become a factor in the progress of the national democratic revolution.

For all that, the events in October 1964 undoubtedly helped the people understand the situation. The people showed in various forms that they no longer trusted the bourgeois and reactionary parties. More and more, they realised the necessity for a revolutionary change of power and strove to unite behind the SCP, Most Party activists held that only by mobilising the masses, raising their ideological level, improving their organisation and uniting them in a broad popular movement could we influence the political structure and lead the people in accomplishing national democratic tasks. It was in that situation, with right-wing influence, declining and the popular movement gaining strength that on May 25, 1969, a group of army officers carried out a coup and seized political power.

To appreciate the Party's attitude to the new regime, it is essential to take account of the situation in the Party at the time and the fact that serious ideological differences had arisen in it. These were due to the emergence of a right wing in the SCP leadership. The difficulty of operating amid continuous persecution and repression had reduced some members of the leadership to a mood of hopelessness and despair. This led to a certain curtailment of revolutionary activity, especially of the effort to unite all progressive social forces in a national democratic front. There were calls for a "suitable" alliance with the bourgeoisie on the latter's terms and in its interests, and for renouncing in its favour the struggle for the leadership of the mass movement. These calls betrayed the right wing's failure to understand the principles of relations with the national bourgeoisie formulated by the Fourth Party Congress (October 1967). The rightists in the Party leadership took an equally wrong view of the principles of co-operation with the petty-bourgeois group of military men that came to power

in May 1969. A policy of unqualified support for the group could merely lose the Party its independence.

The Marxist-Leninist core of the SCP proceeded from the possibility of transforming the group into a revolutionary democratic force. It considered that the army, being a "replica" of society as to social composition, may change its class allegiance at different stages of the revolution and hence support different social, political and economic objectives. This transformation implies that the military will engage in constructive action to solve social and economic development problems on anti-capitalist lines and help to bring about freedom of political activity in the people's interests, remove whatever prevented the masses from using their revolutionary potentialities and establish a national democratic front of the workers, peasants, revolutionary intellectuals and part of the national bourgeoisie. In these circumstances, a correct attitude towards the ruling military group would have encouraged its national-democratic orientation, and discouraged anti-democratic trends. Of course, this presupposed the Party retaining its organisational, political and ideological independence.

The struggle inside the SCP was influenced by the development of some Arab and African liberation movements into national democratic revolutions.

This process provided the basis for the general theoretical conclusion that developing countries led by revolutionary democrats could advance in a socialist direction. Needless to say, the socialist orientation of revolutionary democrats in the national liberation area is an important progressive factor in spite of a certain theoretical vagueness of their conception of socialism. This orientation is expressive, in particular, of the growing political and ideological impact of world socialism on the progress of mankind. On the other hand, we believe it would be wrong to form a political alliance with the revolutionary democrats at the cost of renouncing the struggle for an independent working-class movement and of its party's losing its own political position.

The Party's attitude to diverse social and political forces has always been determined by the desire for alliance with those who help to advance the democratic revolution, to isolate and neutralise the forces that oppose the working class and its political vanguard. The Sudan's experience is proof that such an opposition to the working class and the Party poses a real threat of reactionary changes and plays into the hands of advocates of a capitalist orientation. These principles conditioned the decisions of the SCP conference held in August 1970, or slightly more than a year after the May 1969 coup.

As most of the army officers who had come to power were influenced by the revolutionary democratic ideas current in the Arab region, particularly Egypt, at the time, the conference approved the stand taken by the CC in support of the new regime and advanced a programme of economic, political, social and cultural co-operation with it to transform the armed revolt into a broad and far-reaching popular revolution. To this end, it was indispensable, among other things, to end reactionary influence in the state apparatus, revise financial and economic policy, set out to free the country from the economic oppression of colonialism and neocolonialism while respecting the objective interests of the national bourgeoisie, initiate an agrarian reform, find a democratic solution to the problem of the national minorities in the south of the country and follow a policy of co-operation with countries of the socialist system, first of all with the Soviet Union.

Having examined the situation in the Party, the conference condemned the ight-wing liquidationist tendency and factional activity of those who argued, for nstance, that there were no political or ideological distinctions between the undamental demands of the working class and the programme of the regime. This activity was aimed, in the last resort, at destroying the Party, as has been aid. And so all that could be done to expel the splitters from the Party.

Regrettably, the view which the SCP took in August 1970 in respect of the ikely evolution of the military regime was not borne out by developments. The Party's strong effort to extend the popular basis of the regime and turn it into a road national democratic alliance failed because some army officers on the Revolutionary Council strove to "exclude" the SCP from politics and public life enerally and, indeed, to prove that it "must' be abolished. In the circumstances, hese officers' call for a one-party system was anti-democratic.

This also applies to the slogan of Arab unity,[1] which ignored the social, political and cultural characteristics of the Sudanese and other Arab peoples. The problem of Arab unity was raised before the requisite conditions had been created, including the abolition of the basis for exploitation and the abandonment of an ideology based on narrow nationalism, and before the Arab countries concerned had provided the prerequisites of social progress on democratic lines, with unity meeting the desire of the people of each Arab country and free from all coercion or violence.

The removal of a group of progressive army officers from the Revolutionary Council in November 1970 was a logical sequel to the growing tendency of some leaders of the new regime to reject democratic principles, undermine the ndependent working-class movement and rely more heavily on the military and police machinery.

The imperialists and reactionaries promptly took advantage of these developments. Operating under anti-communist catchwords, they pushed the regime closer and closer to dividing and weakening the unity of democratic forces. The authorities abolished organisations—the trade unions, peasant associations, student and youth leagues—that had been brought into being by the masses and had served them in their revolutionary struggles over a quarter-century. These organisations were supplanted by others formed by decree and inked with an subordinated to the military bureaucracy.

The political atmosphere deteriorated after the regime's bloody repressive measures against noted Communist and democratic leaders following the defeat of the action of army officers' groups in July 1971.

It is in this climate that the SCP is carrying on its fight at the price of heroic sacrifice and with the support of the international solidarity of the progressive forces of the world. At five meetings held after July 1971 (September-November 1971, July 1972, May 1973, January 1974 and June 1975), its Central Committee examined the pressing needs of reorganising the Party and strengthening its unity; it discussed general questions bearing on every aspect of Party life and the revolutionary movement, and the politcal problems facing the country. It adopted decisions providing for more efficient political. ideological and organising work by the Party. The January 1974 meeting was particularly mportant because it concerned itself with organisational matters of the Party, the situation in the trade union movement, and the fundamental tasks of Party activity among the workers, peasants, students, youth and women to increase

influence over the masses and perfect the pattern and methods of Party worl
This was done with due regard to the given alignment of forces, and to the losse
of the Party and the popular movement. The meeting stressed, in particular, th
need to lay solid foundations for work based on the growing role and possibilitie
of the working-class in economic and politcal struggles for general democrati
and trade union freedoms. It decided on specific ways and means c
strengthening the worker-peasant alliance. The CC also pointed to the need fc
sustained ideological and theoretical activity to perfect the national democrati
programme, whose implementation is an objective requirement of our country

The Sudan's economic, political, social and cultural problems, as well as it
problems arising from relations between ethnic communities, are highl
complicated. Experience suggests that to begin solving them effectively, it i
indispensable that all progressive social forces should co-operate. This, in turr
makes it necessary to discard authoritarian forms and methods of governmer
and pursue a policy based on the principles of the national democratic fron
There are objective possibilities for this—they matured throughout the history c
the Sudanese people's anti-colonial and anti-imperialist movement. To translat
these possibilities into reality has been, and remains, the fundamental goal of th
Sudanese Communist Party, which has passed through severe trials and yet i
unbroken and determined to fight on for progressive, far-reaching social an
economic changes, for the vital interests of the working-class and other workin
people, for democracy and socialism.

[1]Meaning the Tripoli Declaration (1969), which provided for the merger of Libya, Egypt and tl
Sudan.

We were Regents

Academician TODOR PAVLOV
Honorary President, Bulgarian Academy of Sciences

Todor Pavlov is a noted Bulgarian Communist, public figure, Marx
philosopher and lecturer. He has been a member of the Bulgarian Coı
munist Party since 1919 and took an active part in the fight against fascis
(for this, the Bulgarian fascist government held him in a concentrati
camp from 1941 to 1943). After the country's liberation (1944), he was
member of the Regency Council and one of the organisers and leaders
socialist construction in Bulgaria. He was a member of the Politi
Bureau, CC BCP, from 1966 to 1976.

Following are Todor Pavlov's recollections of his activity as a rege

HISTORY hardly knows any other case of a working-class party representat
holding the office of regent, as I did. During a member with the members of
Bulgarian Regency Council, Marshal of the Soviet Union Fyodor Tolbukh
Commander of the Third Ukranian Front troops which took part in
liberation of Bulgaria, said with a smile, looking at me: "A Communist rege
Why, that's grand! But whose idea was it?" Although I did not fully realise

significance of what was going on, I told him that the idea was history's, the people's.

Looking back at that episode today and thinking of the brief but interesting record of the Regency Council and of what came before and after it, I find in it much that is instructive—much more than previously. I no longer have any reason to regret that I was made a member of the Council against my wish and contributed as best I could, and as far as the political situation made it possible, to the Council's fruitful activity in the early, particularly difficult yet decisive years of Bulgaria's transition to socialism.

I may yet have an opportunity to tell in greater detail about the formation, functioning and role of the Regency Council. At the moment I will try to answer above all the following question: Why did a Communist become a regent—what made the Party do that?

It is common knowledge that the regency is provisional exercise of the powers of the sovereign during his minority, illness or protracted absence and is the responsibility of a collective body, the regency council, or an individual, the regent. The procedure of establishing a regency and the latter's exercise of power is generally laid down in the Constitution. In Bulgaria, the Regency Council was set up under the Tyrnovo Constitution (1879) after the death of Tsar Boris (1943), for the Crown Prince was under seven years of age. It was composed of Prince Cyril, Bogdan Filov and General Nikola Mikhov, who were all supporters of Hitler Germany.

As a result of the victorious anti-fascist armed rising on September 9, 1944, when the Soviet Army was pressing forward its offensive, the fascist regime in Bulgaria fell and power was assumed by a government of the Fatherland Front. The makers of a policy disastrous to Bulgaria, including the members of the pro-fascist Regency Council, were arrested. However, the regency as an office was preserved because the Constitution made the monarchic form of government legal.

In an exceedingly complicated international and domestic situation, our Party showed political maturity and tact from the very beginning of the formation of a new state apparatus. Our people were faced with the following tasks of fundamental importance: terminating the state of war with the Soviet Union and its allies, breaking completely with Germany, eliminating the monarchy and establishing a people's democratic state. The Communists were well aware of the vast significance of the radical changes to be effected and knew that these could only be brought about with the support of the overwhelming majority of the nation.

"It was necessary," said Georgi Dimitrov afterwards, at the Fifth Party Congress (1948), speaking of that period, "to tackle only the most pressing tasks, without skipping any stage in the developing struggle of the working-class and other working people of town and countryside against capitalism ... The only correct policy was to unite all the anti-fascist, democratic and patriotic forces of the people, including certain anti-German bourgeois elements, on the broadest possible basis in order completely to defeat the fascist clique, join successfully in the anti-Hitler war, defend and safeguard the country's national independence, territorial integrity and state sovereignty. To implement this policy was a prerequisite and a guarantee of maintaining and furthering the historic gains of the popular rising on September 9."

It was this policy that enabled the Party to establish links with the masse strengthen its positions and isolate the enemies of the revolution and of peopl rule. The problem of using certain old institutions of the state was dealt wi accordingly. We preserved for a time such components of the old system regional, district, town and village communal government bodies but impartec new, socialist content to them: the Fatherland Front removed frankly fascist ai other reactionary elements from local government.

Those were the circumstances in which the Party made me a member of t Regency Council. Its two other members were likewise supporters of t Fatherland Front. They were Professor Venelin Ganev, a liberal representing t interests of the bourgeoisie, and Tsviatko Boboshevski, a non-party man w expressed the views of the reactionary section of the bourgeoisie but was Russophile. The new Regency Council, like the Fatherland Front governme which comprised four Communists, four members of the Bulgarian Agricultu People's Union (BAPU), two Social Democrats, four members of the Zve People's Union and two independents, was formed on September 9, the day the rising.

I need hardly say that none of the regents had any experience of governm bodies of that nature. Yet the situation called for prompt and resolute action. begin with, it was necessary to see clear in the intricate domestic and forei political situation and work out (as far as this could be done by advocates Bulgaria's capitalist development and by a Communist) a common approach problems. The armistice signed in October 1944 between the Soviet Uni Britain and the United States, on the one hand, and Bulgaria, on the other, a the establishment of the Allied Control Commission to supervise execution the provisions of the agreement largely facilitated the task. But even so, th were difficulties. Every blunder in the work of the Regency Council or in rega to it could set reactionary forces in motion and delay the country's transition building socialism. The revolutionary masses had to show a particularly ke sense of responsibility and did show it, which certainly helped me as a regent upholding the Party line.

I cannot go into the details of how the Regency Council worked out its vari decisions or of the political actions it took, for this would require too much sp and, besides, would hardly interest the general reader. I will try to give an ide the more important efforts of the Council and of the causes of discord among members after the Bulgarian People's Republic was proclaimed.

Due to the Party's flexible and principled leadership of the incipi revolutionary transformation of society and to the tremendous prestige wh Georgi Dimitrov enjoyed among the masses as the Party's leader, it was on whole easy enough, in spite of disputes, to achieve unanimity on the Council key problems relating to Bulgaria's foreseeable future. What I mean is, first of the issue of joining in the anti-fascist liberation war, which deeply agita Bulgarians and on which the Regency Council adopted an appropriate decisi thus providing more favourable conditions for signing peace and abolishing Allied Control Commission.[1]

The Regency Council promptly took a correct stand on the issue of reforn Bulgaria's royal army on revolutionary lines to bring into being a new, peo democratic army, which was greatly strengthened by the institution of polit

ere mostly Communists—former guerrillas, political prisoners and nderground Party workers. In an exceptionally short time, the army was re- ormed and rid of fascist elements and nazi agents, and joined in fighting the etreating nazi troops late in September 1944 as an ally of the Soviet Army and he People's Liberation Army of Yugoslavia.

In forming the new army, it was decided to keep those officers of the former oyal army who had distinguished themselves in these operations. Most of them, eing professionals proved to be entirely devoted to the ideas of the Fatherland ront and made a noticeable contribution to the training of new commanders of he people's army recruited from workers, peasants and progressive intellectuals.

The Regency Council was also unanimous on a number of other problems, oo. I wish to stress, however, that the speech from the throne delivered by Ganev t the opening of the first session of the People's Assembly (1945) expressed, in ffect, our common idea of the outlook for the political development of ulgaria—common in the sense that it was shared by both the leadership of our arty and the leading bodies of the other Fatherland Front parties, including the BAPU.

On the other hand, the Council could not entirely dispense with compromises, uch as the one over the appointment of General Demyan Velchev, a reactionary olitician who had taken an active part in the fascist coup of June 9, 1923 and had een one of the organisers of the 1934 military coup, to the post of War Minister f the first Fatherland Front government. (As soon as he had assumed his duties, e began to resist the new power, an activity which was promptly stopped, of ourse). It is also indicative that the post of head of government of the Fatherland ront was assigned, on Georgi Dimitrov's proposal, to General Kimon Georgiev, lso a participant in two military coups, a wealthy landowner. (He devotedly erved the Fatherland Front to the end of his days).

Differences which subsequently developed into an ideological and political truggle emerged in the Regency Council after the rise in the middle of 1945 of an pposition group led by Grigory Mikhailov (Gemeto), Nikola Petkov, Georgy Cheshmejiev, Kristyn Lulchev and other BAPU and Social Democrat leaders. What happened was evidently inevitable because the time was drawing near hen the Bulgarian people had to choose the path of their further progress. The pposition, which was backed by wealthy peasants, speculators and the urban ourgeoisie and also enjoyed foreign support, took an intransigent stand against eople's democratic rule. When, after the Moscow Conference[2], it was invited to oin the government, it refused and some ministers opposed to the government, uch as P. Stoyanov, resigned. I tried to dissuade them from stepping down, aying that it was an unwise thing to do, but got nowhere.

Not until it had suffered a really crushing defeat in elections and then lost irtually all ideological and political influence in the country did the opposition et out to normalise and activate its relations with the new, people's democratic egime.

The members of the Regency Council did not participate to an equal degree or n the same way in measures to set Bulgaria on a socialist course. Boboshevski, he spokesman of conservative and reactionary circles, extended his traditionally Russophile sympathy to the new, Soviet Russia. This considerably facilitated the ole of the Communist regent whenever it was necessary to decide on joint Council action against the external and internal enemies of people's rule and the

Ganev disagreed with the Council's policy as the prospect of Bulgari becoming a bourgeois republic faded. He maintained permanent contacts wi the US, British, Italian and other foreign envoys and with opposition leader had large gold deposits in a Bulgarian bank and abroad (as transpire afterwards) and was a hard-line bourgeois ideologist. He wrote articles ar appeals for Nikola Petkov, plotted with bourgeois representatives on the Allie Control Commission and in various diplomatic missions, drafted a typical bourgeois constitution and proposed to discuss it and put it to the vote in tl constitutent People's Assembly as an alternative to the draft Constitutio proposed by Dimitrov and supported by all sound forces of the Fatherlar Front.

But all attempts of this nature by Ganev and his followers, which we designed to maintain a system of inequality and oppression in the country, we doomed to failure. This because perfectly clear during the referendum on t form of government (September 8, 1946) and the elections to the Grand Peopl Assembly (October 27, 1946). The proposal to abolish the monarchy a proclaim Bulgaria a people's republic won 92.7 per cent of the votes cast in t referendum. In the elections to the Grand People's Assembly, the Communi polled over 50 per cent of the votes. The leading role of our Party in the soc development of the country and its high prestige among the masses were beyo all doubt.[3] After the Regency Council had been abolished, Ganev, who persist in active opposition, was banished to the town of Dryanovo. Afterwards, response to a proposal submitted by this writer to the then Chairman of t Council of Ministers, Vylko Chervenkov, Ganev was allowed to return to Sofi He was given back his confiscated house and granted a regent's pension and t title of corresponding member of the Bulgarian Academy of Sciences. I declined the title but engaged in research which resulted in a valuable work Tsar Krum's[4] laws. This work was well received on the whole by historians a law experts in both Bulgaria and other socialist countries. Genev also wrot scholarly book on some theoretical problems of music, but failing hea prevented continuation of his work. When he died he was buried with hono befitting his one-time office of regent. Shortly before his death, he told repeatedly that he thought the opposition had failed owing to the ove complicated situation at home and abroad. At the same time, he acknowled the growing political influence of the Soviet Union in the world and its enorm economic and military power. He went no further than putting that evident f on record. It is revealing, however, that although he was a firm supporter capitalism, he had in the end to accept that fact after witnessing the collapse counter-revolutionary attempts to reverse the march of history.

Reaction's plans failed completely. The struggle against remnants of monarchy, the bourgeoisie and its accomplices, which was particularly bitte 1946 and 1947, did not develop into a civil war as certain circles had apparer expected it to. This did not happen due primarily to the tremendous prestige a influence of the Communist Party and the Fatherland Front among the mass

But a factor of no less importance was, beyond all doubt, the presence of Soviet troops, who did not interfere in the country's internal affairs yet preven reaction from trying armed struggle and inspired confidence in the strengt people's democratic rule. I have been convinced ever since my regency days t without the Soviet Union, let alone against the Soviet Union and its friends

allies, we would have been unable to accomplish the September revolution, which was people's democratic in form and socialist in content, or begin building a socialist society and marching towards communism.

In October 1947, an enlarged meeting of the Party Central Committee decided to speed the country's social and economic development. It stressed that this depended on the Grand People's Assembly approving the PRB Constitution and on the early and judicious reorganisation of the state apparatus according to the Constitution and with a view to advancing the country towards socialism. The socialist Constitution was adopted by the Assembly on December 4, 1947. As a result, the Tyrnovo Constitution became null and void, the monarchy was abolished, the gains of the socialist revolution were given legal form, and opportunities were created for its further development.

The problem of transition to socialism and of the ways in which the working class can win power is central to the theory of the socialist revolution and is solved according to the historical conditions of development of the revolution and the national characteristics of the country concerned. The preservation and functioning of the Regency Council may be regarded as something extraordinary or exceptional in the development of the socialist revolution. Recalling the meeting with Marshal Tolbukhin I mentioned at the beginning, I think the answer I gave him was also correct in the sense that that relatively accidental fact was influenced by trends "operating and materialising with iron necessity", as Marx expressed it. Lenin wrote: "The class struggle waged by the proletariat *for* the sympathy and support of the majority of the working people does not end with the conquest of political power by the proletariat. *After* the conquest of power this struggle *continues*, but in *other* forms" (*Coll. Works*, Vol. 30, p. 60). After the Fifth BCP Congress, it became particularly obvious that people's democracy in Bulgaria was not merely an executor of the function of proletarian dictatorship, as it had seemed originally. In reality it was a genuine form of proletarian power, but with distinct tactics, slogans and pace of revolutionary social transformations. What helped to achieve victory was an understanding of the logic of historical development and the distinctive conditions of Bulgaria, on the one hand, and a thorough knowledge of the general laws of the revolutionary process, on the other, both of which are at the basis of our Party's entire activity.

The peace treaty which put Bulgaria on an equal footing with other democratic states was signed in Paris on February 10, 1947. The Bulgarian government delegation to the peace conference was led by Vasil Kolarov, interim President of the Republic, Political Bureau member of the CC BCP.—*Ed.*

Conference of the Foreign Ministers of the Soviet Union, USA and Britain (December 1945), which decided to draft peace treaties with Italy, Rumania, Bulgaria, Hungary and Finland.—*Ed.*

The Communists held 278 seats, or 60 per cent of the total, in the Grand National Assembly. According to a universally accepted parliamentary tradition, the Party could have formed a government of its own. Instead, it poposed to form a government of all Patriotic Front parties.—*Ed.*

Ruler of the first Bulgarian kingdom (early ninth century)—*Ed.*

In Brief

FRANCE

Party cards are being exchanged in FCP branches. At the same time, a campaig for the formation of new branches is going on in the factories. The exchange o cards is making good progress in Nord Department, for instance, where it i planned to increase the Party membership to 25,000 this year. It is also makin headway in Toulouse, Marseilles and other cities. An appeal by the C(Secretariat in connection with the card-exchanging campaign points out tha 105,000 persons joined the Party in 1976. The goal this year is to raise the strengt of the FCP to 600,000 and the number of factory branches, to 10,000.

INDONESIA

The CC of the Communist Party Indonesia has released a statement on tl general election due in May 1977. It says that the election will be held in a countı where 100,000 political prisoners are still in jail or concentration camp withoı trial, where patriots fighting against imperialism and neocolonialism, for worl peace, are still an object of persecution and repression and even parties known a "legal" are under unrelenting pressure. The election will be a travesty, demagogical ploy of the regime.

The CC CPI statement points out that the social and economic reforn promised before the 1971 elections have yet to be carried out. The country wrestling with serious economic problems. The regime's policy still benefi primarily foreign monopolies, which are turning the country into an instrumeı of the global anti-Communist strategy of international imperialism.

The statement stresses that genuine democracy in Indonesia cannot l achieved through undemocratic elections but through a growing struggle by tl whole people for a national unity front, a radical transformation of the preseı regime and a genuinely national and democratic government representing tl interests of the whole Indonesian people.

S. S-

MPR

The CC of the Mongolian People's Revolutionary Party has held conferenc of Party branch secretaries in Ulan Bator, Darkhan, Arbai-Khere, Tsetserle Ulyasutai and Sain Shand. The conferences were attended by 60 per cent of tl secretaries.

The conferences, guided by Political Bureau members and secretaries of tl CC MPRP, were among important measures for the implementation of tl decisions of the 17th Party Congress aimed at raising the role and efficiency Party branches. They discussed steps to increase Party influence on every aspe of the life and activity of work teams and improve methods of Party leadership the economic and cultural spheres. The conferences generalised the experience Party committees in carrying out the Party's economic policy and educating tl working people in a communist spirit. They stressed the need to widely study aı creatively apply the experience of the CPSU in guiding socialist and communi construction.

'ORTUGAL

The CC Political Commission of the Portuguese Communist Party has called n the Communists and all friends and supporters of the Party to launch a fund-aising campaign in support of the PCP. The overthrow of the fascist ictatorship, the establishment of freedom, revolutionary gains and struggle to naintain these gains are inseparable from PCP activity, says the Political 'ommission in a statement published in *Avante*. The responsibility of the PCP is rowing with the evolution of the domestic political situation. Party rganisations are faced with ever more diverse and complicated tasks. The Party eeds greater funds to ensure that these tasks are accomplished and that its rganisations develop and gain in strength.

The PC statement urges those who join in the fund-raising campaign to turn it nto a movement for closer unity. To take part in this campaign, it notes, is to ontribute one's share to the defence and consolidation of democratic freedoms, ationalisation, the agrarian reform and worker control in the enterprises, and elp in advancing democracy towards socialism. A committee has been set up to o-ordinate the campaign.

JRUGUAY

Carta, underground newspaper of the Communist Party of Uruguay, has carried a report on the minimum programme put forward by the Communists in view of the critical domestic situation. The slogan of re-establishing human rights and democratic freedoms, it writes, unites the broadest political and social circles; it is supported by the forces of international solidarity and holds first place in the minimum programme for a way out of the present grave situation. The programme demands an immediate end to the torture of detained persons and to new arrests on ideological, political and trade union grounds. It contains a plan for the release of political prisoners and a plan for the restoration of democratic freedoms, primarily freedom of association in trade unions, assembly and the press.

VIETNAM

New CPV Rules

The Communist Party of Vietnam has published the new CPV Rules adopted by its Fourth Congress. The Rules comprise a preamble and eleven chapters.

The preamble, entitled "The Party and the Fundamental Problems of Party Building", states that the CPV is the party of the working class of Vietnam, the vanguard, organised militant contingent and highest organisation of this class. It is a true representative of the interests of the working class and other working people and of the country as a whole. Furthermore, the Party fulfills its obligations to the international Communist movement. The Party is composed of communist-minded people, of the most exemplary, valorous and devoted members of the working class, collective-farm peasantry and socialist intelligentsia and other working people who have decided to join the Party in order to fight for its goals and ideals. The aim of the Party is to build socialism and communism in Vietnam.

The Communist Party of Vietnam, the Rules point out, considers Marxism-Leninism the Party's ideological basis and guide in all its work. The CPV is the main force of the dictatorship of the proletariat. It is faced with the task of

uniting the leadership of the entire activity of the state and of society concentrating the efforts of the whole people, building socialism throughout the country and constantly defending national independence and unity.

The Communist Party, the Rules stress, combines genuine patriotism with proletarian internationalism, maintains close links with the masses and invariably concerns itself with building a system of socialist collective leadership. It means monolithic unity of will and action. The Party is organised on the principle of democratic centralism. A most important part of the revolutionary cause of the CPV is steadfastly to build and strengthen the Party and raise its leading role in society.

The Rules set out in detail 59 specific provisions regarding the conditions for Party membership, the rights and duties of members, the principle of democratic centralism, the organisational structure of the Party, the functioning of its highest leading body, Party organisations and elected bodies at all levels, the Party Control Committee, and the leading role of the Party in the state and in respect of mass organisations, the Ho Chi Minh Communist Youth League, etc.

Viewpoints

Crisis in the Citadel of Racism and Apartheid

YUSUF DADOO
Chairman, South African Communist Party

LAST year saw a massive upsurge of the movement against the inhuman system of apartheid—a new chapter in the history of the struggles carried on by the oppressed people of our country. The tide of indignation and protest among the long-suffering people of South Africa, set off by the heroic revolt in Soweto, may be regarded as one of the greatest acts of resistance in the history of anti-colonial, anti-imperialist and anti-racist battles in Africa. This has lifted the revolutionary movement in South Africa to a qualitatively higher level, furnishing another proof that the deep-going changes in the world are irreversible. The balance of power has positively shifted in favour of the powerful mainstream of revolutionary change—the socialist world, the working class in the capitalist countries and the national liberation movement.

The current revolutionary upsurge in our country is connected with a number of domestic and international factors.

Among these, a major factor is the impoverishment of the Black people, the African majority. The per capita income gap between whites and blacks is 14 to 1 and the whites (16.7 per cent of the population) receive 76.5 per cent of the country's gross domestic product. Approximately 90 per cent of the Africans live below the poverty datum line which covers only the absolute minimum required for the reproduction of labour power. In the so-called Bantustans,[1] already suffering from overcrowding, the situation has been made intolerable by th

forcible deportation to those areas of over two million Africans from so-called "White South Africa". Herded into what are virtually concentration camps, the deportees, primarily old people and children, are doomed to die of starvation and lack of any social and medical care and attention.

Nearly two million Africans are unemployed. They live in horrible conditions and receive no unemployment benefits from the racist state. The prices of necessities keep soaring, so does inflation, and the living standards of the African population are going down. This, naturally, evokes protest among the population, inducing the Africans to purposeful revolutionary action.

Speaking about the international factors that have largely helped to change the situation in favour of the revolutionary forces in South Africa, mention should be made, above all, of the deep psychological and political impact of the victories in Mozambique, Angola and Guinea-Bissau, and of the collapse of Portuguese fascism and colonialism. Most of all, the defeat of the imperialist aggression by the people of Angola led by MPLA has been of utmost significance in fortifying the confidence of the Black people in their ability to launch an offensive with the objective of overthrowing the apartheid regime and seizing power. The battles of Angola have forever shattered the myth of the superiority of the colonialists and the invincibility of the armed forces of the South African imperialists. Like the victories of the Vietnamese people, the events that took place in the south of Africa in the mid-seventies demonstrate that a people fighting for its freedom does not fight alone. This was clearly evidenced by the assistance rendered by the socialist countries, especially Cuba and the Soviet Union, on the basis of the principles of proletarian internationalism.

The intensified political and guerrilla activities in Namibia and Zimbabwe have also greatly contributed to the growing ferment of resistance in South Africa. Progressive and democratic forces in our country welcomes the decision of the frontline African states to render full support to the Patriotic Front in Zimbabwe—another blow to the attempts by the racists and imperialists to impose a neocolonialist solution on the people of Zimbabwe. In the conditions of the changed balance of forces in the international arena, the imperialist-racist alliance is unable, even with US support, to install puppet regimes in southern Africa. The broad masses in South Africa are becoming increasingly aware of this fact.

And, last but not the least, the revolutionary impact of the events in the mid-seventies in the South of Africa is that they have clearly demonstrated to the exploited and oppressed in our country, by the example, in the first place, of South Africa's closest neighbours—Angola and Mozambique—that a militant, united and disciplined people led by revolutionary movements following socially progressive policies and fully supported by progressive mankind can defeat even the most powerful enemy.

These are, in brief, the preconditions of the developments which began in Soweto, a suburb of Johannesburg, last June, when school-children rose in revolt against the imposition of Afrikaans as a language to be studied in African schools. These developments swept right across the country, marking a new stage in the revolutionary struggle to seize power for the people and overthrow the much hated system of apartheid. The Soweto revolt demonstrated the wish of the young to take an active part in the mounting revolutionary struggle and signalled the start of massive acts of protest and resistance against the Vorster regime

which holds millions of Black people, Africans, Coloureds and Indians bondage.

Defying the shooting by the hirelings of the South African fascist politic machine, the oppressed—the youth, students and workers—went into the stree They have demonstrated their courage, a will to oppose the racist regime, readiness to sacrifice their lives in the name of freedom.

Contrary to the claims by the world capitalist press, it was not only tl students and unemployed youth who participated in the militant actions. Sin last June the African working class, especially in the two k cities—Johannesburg and Cape Town—has come out on two successive thre day general strikes in the face of intimidation from the employers and police. Tl employers cut the wages of the strikers, forced many workers to sleep on tl premises and issued dire threats of dismissal whilst the heavily armed raci police tried to compel them to resume work. But, encouraged by their successf actions, the workers responded by stubborn resistance. It is appropriate here recall a well-known utterance by Lenin who said that "strikes... teach tl workers to unite; they show them that they can struggle against the capitali only when they are united; strikes can teach workers to think of the struggle of tl whole working class against the whole class of factory owners and against t arbitrary, police government" *(Coll. Works,* Vol. 4, p. 317).

Another significant aspect in the nationwide movement is that it was joined l the coloured population, especially the coloured community of the Ca Province. Thousands of Coloureds came out in solidarity demonstrations a protests in the face of police brutality and shootings, Undaunted by tl brutalities and mass arrests, the Coloured and African youth students joint demonstrated in the very heart of Cape Town's business and commercial distri In Durban some sections of the Indian community also came out in solidari with their African brothers. The 1976 events in South Africa demonstrated t growing unity of the oppressed Black people—Africans, Coloureds, India This process could not be reversed by the numerous attempts of the authorities divide them.

Since the middle of last year South Africa has been the scene of daily clash between the enraged and trigger-happy police and unarmed civilians, of gene strikes and boycotts, and sometimes virtual uprisings. The ferment of milita resistance, which engulfed the whole country last year, has substantia deepened the crisis of capitalism and racism in South Africa.

The symptoms of the crisis are manifest in the economy, politics and ideolo It is penetrating ever more deeply into the ruling social, economic and politi system in South Africa.

Between 1963 and 1973, white South Africa enjoyed one of its most ra periods of economic growth. This economic boom with an annual growth rate over 5 per cent was only possible because of the brutal suppression of the natio liberation and working-class movements, bad working conditions and t absence of social security, the fascist-type rigid control and regimentation black labour power, and the use of cheap migratory labour. But this boom is n over and South Africa, like the rest of the capitalist world, is going throug serious economic crisis, a crisis that is exacerbated in South Africa by t apartheid laws, which constitute an obstacle to economic recovery. Inflation South Africa is among the highest in the world. In the past two years the So

African currency has already been devalued twice, by a total of 23 per cent, and in mid-June 1976. the trade deficit increased by more than 40 per cent (from $1,700 million in 1975 to $2,400 million).[2] The economic growth rate last year was negative, with very little prospect for improvement in the near future.

South Africa has to cover its trade deficit by the inflow of foreign capital and from the sale of gold. But both have decreased rather sharply. According to the racist Minister of Economic Affairs, Chris Hennis, South Africa's net inflow of foreign capital has declined from R620 million[3] in the last quarter of 1975 to only R89 million in the second quarter of 1976.

Alarmed by the economic decline, the main organisations representing the interests of the monopolists and white businessmen, have been pressing the racist regime for political reforms which, they believe, would impart a stimulus to the economy and check the growth of social tension, which is proving so dangerous for the regime. They are calling, in particular, for the creation of a black middle class, removal of constraints upon blacks doing certain skilled jobs and giving the Africans in the urban areas a little more security.

Foreign investors are also perturbed about the present political situation. Fearful of losing their "investors' paradise", which South Africa was considered to be only recently, they have also called for some reforms, as they wish to preserve the basic socio-economic structures which enable them to reap exceptionally high profits from the super-exploitation of black labour power. Although the racist regime now finds it increasingly difficult to raise money abroad, it managed to borrow R400 million on the Euromarket, got a R160 million loan from the IMF and a R260 million loan from the giant City Bank of America. This goes to show that racists enjoy the full support of international capital.

The 1976 events have sharply aggravated the political crisis in the country, brought the racist regime into deeper isolation and facilitated the further maturing of the revolutionary situation.

Lenin pointed out: "Oppression alone, no matter how great, does not always give rise to a revolutionary situation in a country. In most cases it is not enough for revolution that *the lower classes should not want* to live in the old way. It is also necessary that *the upper classes should be unable* to rule and govern in the old way" (Vol. 19, pp. 221-222).

The Vorster regime today is showing increasing inability "to rule and govern in the old way". The powers that be are all out to find solutions and reforms which, they imagine, can defuse the highly volatile political situation. There is, however, no clarity among the various sections of the ruling class on a way out of the crisis. Even within the ruling Afrikaner National Party, there are fundamental differences on this matter. There are some Afrikaners who rigidly believe that no reforms or concessions should be made and that the old approach should be followed. There are others, like the editors of the two mouthpieces of the National Party—*Transvater* and *Burger*—and leading Afrikaner politicians, monopolists and businessmen who agree with certain foreign imperialist forces that unless some reforms are made the country will rapidly move into a revolutionary situation to the detriment of the entire system of capitalism.

The ruling circles are now faced with an insoluble dilemma: how under the present circumstances to adapt the policy and ideology of the regime, without changing its racist nature, to the goals of South Africa's development along the

lines of monopoly capitalism. Hence the search for "new" methods c management and attempts to get rid of the most irksome aspects of racism, suc as "petty apartheid",[4] in order to keep intact the basic structure of apartheic More than ever before the enemy understands that it must secure the support (Black collaborationists.

Vorster's regime hopes that a Black middle class comprising African trader: administrators, especially in the Bantustans, some Coloured and part of th Indian commercial bourgeoisie and professionals will fulfil the role (collaborationists. But as long as apartheid is in operation, only a minority of th Black middle class is likely to fully support the policies of the racist regime.

The deed socio-economic and political crisis is also reflected in the greate militarisation of the economy and the huge arms build-up. It is estimated that th record military budget of R1,350 million for 1976, an increase of 40 per cent ove the previous year, will be exceeded. White South Africa is now one of the mo: heavily armed civilian populations in the world. Every day the fascist regime cal upon the whites—men, women and children—to prepare themselve psychologically, physically and militarily to combat the freedom fighter Compulsory cadet training has been introduced this year for all white high scho(students. What Vorster fears above all is the escalation of guerrilla activities t the territory of South Africa.

The ideology of racism is also in disarray. Instead of open racism an chauvinism, the politicians and ideologues of the ruling class attempt t camouflage their anti-human and obscurantist ideas with sophisticate demagogy. They claim that the policy of apartheid is not racist because it supposed to give the Africans "independence" in their own areas—in tl Bantustans. Pik Botha, South Africa's ambassador to the UN, asserted th: Vorster's regime was prepared to dismantle discrimination based solely c colour. Dr. Connie Mulder, Minister of Interior and Information, who is wide tipped as a possible successor to Vorster, claimed in an interview given to tl *Rand Daily Mail*: "Is it discrimination solely on the basis of colour if I refuse, a white, to have other people in the white parliament, if at the same time I crea opportunities for other people in their own parliaments? Even if it discriminatory, it is also discriminatory against the white man who will have r authority in the Transkei."[5] In essence this rhetoric means that the Afric: people in the so-called "white areas" of South Africa—87 per cent of tl country—will have no rights whatsoever and the reality of racist oppression not going to be altered.

Our Party believes that only a revolutionary change in the social system c: help overcome these conflicts by putting an end to the colonial and raci oppression of the Black people.

This is not an easy task to accomplish. The revolutionary struggle in o country is a complex, immensely difficult and at times contradictory process. V shall utilise different forms and methods, armed and unarmed, illegal and leg: and planned mass actions, to strengthen the capacity and determination of t oppressed and exploited and to weaken the enemy's morale. At the same time t revolutionaries should have a clear idea of the essence and direction of th struggle.

The characteristic thing about our revolution is that it is developing conditions of extreme national oppression, expressed in the system of racism a

apartheid, which deprives the oppressed majority of the people, the creator of the wealth of the nation, of even the very minimum economic and political rights. Thus, the main content of our struggle is the national liberation of the African people from the yoke of racist and colonialist rule. As monopoly capitalism is closely linked with the racist system of oppression, the tasks of national liberation are closely linked with those of social liberation. Furthermore, the country has attained a social and economic level that provides objective material preconditions (the developed capitalist state sector, large-scale and mechanised farming) for transition to an advanced social system. When free, the people of South Africa will be able to proceed towards socialism fairly rapidly.

In the coming battles, as in the past, the African working class, steeled and tempered in numerous struggles, is called upon to play its historic role. It is being increasingly concentrated in large enterprises, rapidly gaining political maturity and quickly absorbing the lessons of discipline, unity and organisation. The working class has shown in practice that it is the leading force in the struggle for national and social liberation. For over three decades the fascist regime has tried to bludgeon it into submission by fascist terror, shootings, the imprisonment and torture of its leaders and trade unionists and refusing to recognise the right of African trade unions to exist. But of no avail. Over the past three years, even though it was illegal for African workers to strike, we have had over 1,000 strikes involving hundreds of thousands of workers. All of them had a political content.

Operating in conditions of naked terror, the ANC and SACP have greatly contributed to the ferment of militant resistance amongst the oppressed masses. The continuous stream of illegal propaganda and agitational material, including the newspapers of the two organisations, plays a crucial role. One of the appeals of the Communist Party says in part: "Workers! Comrades! We are the backbone of the struggle for national liberation. It is only our collective strength which will ensure that the mass of the people will benefit from liberation, and not just the few who want to step into the shoes of the white exploiters".

"Intensify the struggle for higher wages and better conditions! Build strong black trade unions! Organise secret committees of the most reliable workers to lead the struggle in the factories! Support and strengthen your political organisation--the South African Communist Party!

"Study the liberating ideas of Marxism-Leninism and fight against anti-Sovietism and anti-Communism—the weapons of the enemy. Support and strengthen the African National Congress and its allies in the National Liberation Front."

Comradely relations between the SACP and the ANC are steadily growing stronger. The working class in South Africa is an integral and indispensable part of the national liberation movement headed by the ANC. The Party's relations with the ANC are based on mutual confidence and mutual commitment and determination to overthrow the white minority regime. This has led to greater clarity and understanding on the part of both organisations on how to evolve the correct revolutionary strategic perspectives and tactical manoeuvres in the revolutionary struggle.

Today the national liberation and working class movements are facing a number of important political, organisational and ideological tasks. They are to be accomplished in the conditions when the racist regime, reeling under the mighty blows of the people's resistance, is preparing to hit back. It has already

stepped up the implementation of its Bantustan policy and is trying to balkani: the country, divide the African people into tribal groupings, split the anti-raci front and isolate the ANC and SACP from the people. Our primary duty is to fc the racist scheme, and prevent the international recognition of the so-calle "independent" Transkei. To be sure, Vorster, supported by world imperialisn will encourage the activities of tribalists, renegades and reactionaries, and w must learn from the experience of Angola, where UNITA and FNLA were use as the shock-troops of imperialism, racism and neocolonialism.

The future course of the revolutionary struggle is going to be determined fir and foremost by the mobilisation of the African working class and its close linl with the rural population. To fulfil this task the SACP and ANC intend t encourage the African workers to create their own factory committees—lega semi-legal and illegal—and use their collective strength to fight relentlessly fc higher wages, better working conditions and free trade union rights. In this batt the revitalisation of the South African Congress of Trade Unions, the only noı racial trade union centre, is imperative. Well experienced in class battle SACTU has the responsibility of leading the trade unions' struggle for the immediate as well as long-range goals.

The urgent task today is to enlist the support of more and more coloured an Indian workers in the struggle of the African workers for common interests, t achieve a broader participation of coloureds and Indians and their registere trade unions in the strike movement. In their efforts to disrupt the unity of tl black people, Vorster may offer coloureds and Indians certain concession promising them certain political and economic rights in the distant future. It therefore vitally necessary for the liberation movement to build up the unity (the oppressed people and ensure that the overwhelming majority of coloure(and Indians reject the attempt to divide them from their natural allies an comrade-in-arms—the African people. It is this unity in action that will ensuı the speedier demise of the racist regime and of the capitalism which sustains an nurtures it.

Another urgent task of the revolutionary forces is to rebuff anti-Communisı and anti-Sovietism in all its manifestations. Anti-Communism constitutes a organic part of the policy and ideology of apartheid. Under the Suppression (Communism Act the SACP was banned in 1950, and the ANC in 1960; tens (thousands have been imprisoned, arrested and tortured. Following the racis imperialist defeat in Angola there has been a deluge of wild, hysterical ant Communist, anti-Soviet and anti-Cuban propaganda. It was impressed on whit South Africans that they alone would have to fight the "Communist menace' Vorster, after ruefully reflecting on Angola, bitterly declared, "If, therefore, Communist onslaught should be made against South Africa, directly or und(camouflage, then South Africa will have to face it alone and certain countri(who profess to be anti-Communist will even refuse to sell arms to South Africa t beat off the attack." Statements of this sort are meant to spur anti-Communi: hysteria and secure stronger support for the racist regime on the part of worl imperialism.

Today we face the important problem of strengthening our undergroun machinery. Our illegal structures are constantly improving their style of worl introducing innovatory methods to prevent detection and arrest and are forgin closer links with the masses. The underground cadres understand that the illega

tructures must fully utilise whatever opportunities there are for mass political ıction that ties in with the immediate and long-term needs and grievances of the eople.

After decades of peaceful mass militant resistance, the main revolutionary orces in South Africa have come to the conclusion that to defeat this fascist nonster we are to prepare our people, organisations and cadres for armed evolutionary struggle. But we are hampered by the thorny problem of logistics n this struggle, since every single inch of the country's territory has felt the jack-oot of fascist rule, and enemy troops can very rapidly reach any point in the ountry. Our party believes that it is imperative to create political conditions in vhich armed revolutionary struggle can not only be initiated but also sustained. Armed struggle has to be directly linked to the intensification of mass action. Of reat significance for the further development of the armed struggle is the fact hat hundreds of young workers and students are leaving the country illegally to oin the ANC and its military wing Unkhonto We Sizwe (Spearhead of the ation), in order to acquire the political and military skills with which to onfront the enemy.

As Vorster and his clique find themselves in growing isolation in South Africa, eople throughout the world angrily condemn the racist regime, this bastion of nperialism, neocolonialism and counter-revolution in Africa, and expose the olicy of the imperialist quarters supporting it. World public opinion is gravely oncerned over the fact that South Africa, which already possesses a onsiderable military potential, including such barbaric means of mass nnihilation as napalm and nerve gas, is about to acquire nuclear weapons.[6] Racist South Africa is not a signatory to the nuclear non-proliferation treaty and herefore presents a threat to the peoples, to peace in Africa and the world, a hreat which now comes from the policies followed by the racists. Therefore it is ncountering a powerful rebuff at home and abroad.

The international solidarity movement with the oppressed people of South Africa is gaining momentum. In this struggle the international Communist novement has consistently played a significant part, demonstrating that it is in he forefront of the struggle against all forms of exploitation, racism and fascism. Ever greater numbers of democrats, progressives and anti-racists in the capitalist ountries are now demanding that their governments withdraw their support rom the racist regime. With ever greater vigour the majority of the African ountries, through the OAU, are expressing their deep commitment to clear Africa of the remnants of racist colonial regimes. All revolutionaries and patriots n our country welcomed the worldwide Week of Solidarity with the workers and eople of Southern Africa held in January 1977 in response to an appeal from all he three international trade union federations—WFTU, ICFTU and WCL.

It is the duty of all progressives in the world to curb the racists. The nternational campaign to isolate the racist regime economically, politically, nilitarily and diplomatically must be taken to higher levels. To achieve this, we nust continually expose the anti-Communist and anti-people course of the Vorster regime, oppose the Pretoria—Tel-Aviv axis, this sworn enemy of the ational liberation movement, and obstruct the US plans to set up a South Atlantic organisation of South Africa, Argentine, Brazil, Chile, Paraguay and Uruguay.

The fighters for freedom and social progress in our country are fully convinced

that racist imperialist slavery will not last long and that racism and wor imperialism will fail to reverse the course of history. The revolutionary forces le by the ANC and SACP are totally committed to the destruction of apartheid ar fascism in South Africa.

About 15 years ago, we South African Communists wrote in our Programn that the system of colonialism and racial oppression in our country w powerfully challenged and would be overthrown by the unified struggle national-liberation and working-class movements, that had grown, developed experience and maturity and become steeled in many years of complex ar difficult struggle. The developments of the recent past clearly confirm th conclusion. The mass movement against the racist regime, which started Soweto, has reached unprecedented proportions, involving millions of tl oppressed—Africans, coloured and Indians -and is growing broader. Now it more obvious than ever before that the racists' defeat is inevitable.

---

[1] See Y. Dadoo. *Crisis of Apartheid*, *WMR*, February 1975 *Ed.*

[2] *International Herald Tribune*, October 13, 1976

[3] South African rand equals $1.15.

[4] Open segregation of Africans, Coloureds and Indians in Public places, in transport, etc. *E*

[5] On October 26, 1976, the government of South Africa granted "independence" to the Transl Bantustan, which is another political farce, as that territory and its puppet rulers are who dependent on the racist regime. *Ed.*

[6] Military nuclear research, conducted in South Africa with the connivance and support of cert imperialist quarters, has reached a level when this country may come to possess nuclear weapons the near future, even, according to some sources, within a few months.

The Outlook for Detente and Disarmament

Two Interviews

The problem of disarmament involves the fundamental interests of countries and the whole of mankind. Peace-loving opinion has to play important part in solving it, in bringing about real progress towar ending the arms race. This has been the theme of numerous representati meetings, particularly at the recent World Forum of Peace Forces Moscow and the latest session of the World Peace Council Presidium Sofia.

WMR has interviewed Romesh Chandra, Secretary of the World Pe Council, and Gerhard Kade, Vice-President of the Vienna Internatio Institute for Peace, member of the Leading Bureau of the Committee Peace, Disarmament and Co-operation (FRG), professor at the Darmst Higher Technical University, member of the SPD, on the significance the struggle for disarmament and detente.

ROMESH CHANDRA: New Initiatives Inspire Optimism

Q. The last months of 1976 and the early months of 1977 saw new ma international events. Which of these events would you describe as particula favourable to detente and disarmament?

A. A number of governments, some non-governmental organisations and pokesmen of diverse political and other social forces have lately put forward roposals to promote the "spirit of Helsinki". Among the most important of hese initiatives are the proposals of the Political Consultative Committee (PCC) f the Warsaw Treaty countries, which met in Bucharest last November. The roposals comprise numerous measures relating to the military, economic and ultural spheres of international relations. They carry unprecedented political nd moral weight, because they are a product of the co-ordinated peace policy of he socialist community, which is marching in the van of the struggle for peace nd social progress. I would like to lay special emphasis on the socialist countries' ppeal to all signatories of the Final Act of the Helsinki Conference to commit hemselves never to be the first to use nuclear weapons in any armed conflict. 'his initiative accords entirely with the Helsinki spirit. A treaty against using uclear weapons first could substantially ease international tensions and give the eoples of Europe and the world greater security.

Also worthy of full support is the Bucharest proposal to renounce extension of nembership of the Warsaw Treaty Organisation and NATO. The socialist ountries in the WTO have repeatedly signified their willingness to discuss the bolition of the two opposed military blocs. The PCC confirmed this proposal at s Bucharest meeting. At a time when NATO rejects the idea, the proposal to enounce extension of the number of nations in the two blocs should become a tarting point in the campaign for military detente. It is essential to foil plans to ring Spain into NATO and set up a military bloc in the South Atlantic involving acist South Africa and the Brazilian fascist regime—a bloc that would merely be branch of NATO. It is fair to say that the Warsaw Treaty countries have again emonstrated their readiness to go on working for detente.

Q. How do you regard the negative stand on the socialist countries' proposals aken by the NATO Council in Brussels?

A. Detente provides new, more favourable conditions for the struggle of all eoples for peace, security and social progress. This causes particular concern to eaction and, last but not least, to the NATO leadership, which is very strongly nfluenced by the most reactionary, aggressive circles in the United States. It is ot accidental, therefore, that NATO generally plays a delaying role in matters of etente and disarmament.

Revealingly, NATO rejected the Warsaw Treaty countries' proposals in the nidst of a growing campaign against the "Soviet military threat", a campaign 'hich militarists and the military industrial complex use as an argument in avour of more war preparations and greater arms spending. The campaign is een with concern by all intelligent people, who realise that the answer to the uestion whether peace on earth is to be or not to be, and whether or not the arms ace should continue, cannot be left to bellicose Pentagon and NATO generals or the monopolies that make profit by manufacturing and selling arms. This is a natter for responsible statesmen and for the peoples whose destinies are nvolved. It is only logical that in reply to the NATO reactionaries' rejection of he latest proposals of the PCC, numerous non-governmental organisations, rade unions, peace organisations, prominent politicians, MOs and members of ome governments in the non-socialist part of the world have voiced support for hese initiatives.

Peace movements in all countries are working to make the significance of the

Bucharest declaration known and mobilising public opinion to compel tl leaders of NATO countries to take, on their part, specific and constructive ste towards lessening military tensions.

The actions of the peace forces are aimed at isolating reactionary politiciar generals and industrialists trying to step up the arms race, which is the princip obstacle in the way of the consolidation of detente and, indeed, threatens to sl down and even stop the process. Over 400 million people in more than a hundr countries of the world have already signed the New Stockholm Appeal for an e to the arms race, for disarmament.

Due to the activity of the World Peace Council, more and more people t world over are coming to realise that in this age, security cannot be achieved stockpiling armaments but solely through political means, by putti international relations on a sound basis, fostering detente, following reasonable foreign policy and ending the arms race without delay.

Q. Does that mean that in spite of the difficulties created by the enemies detente and disarmament, you take an optimistic view of the chances of curb the arms race and carrying forward international detente?

A. Certainly. The initiatives I have mentioned inspire us with optimism consider that this year has begun in an atmosphere of growing confidence in t people's ability to make an even more effective contribution to the great cause safeguarding and promoting peace. This confidence rests on the solid basis of t gains made by detente as a result of the peoples' struggle for peace and natior independence, for disarmament, economic and social progress, restructuring international economic relations, and for human rights.

I wish, first of all, to point out the role which has been played in this process the peace policy of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries, t implementation of the Soviet Peace Programme and its continuation in t Programme of Further Struggle for Peace and International Co-operati approved in 1976. This is why Leonid Brezhnev, General Secretary of the C CPSU, had every reason to say in his interview with Joseph Kingsbury-Smith, American political commentator: "By achieving political detente, we have al paved the way for really concerning ourselves with key problems of limiti armaments and disarmament." Leonid Brezhnev expressed the hope that t year 1977 would really be a turning point in the effort to stop the arms race.

This is what the Soviet Union's peace-loving and humanist policy seeks. see it in the Soviet government's efforts for a new agreement with the US limiting strategic armaments. We see it in the efforts of the Soviet Union a other countries of the socialist community to achieve progress in the Vienna tal on mutual cuts in armed forces and armaments in Central Europe. We see it many other steps of the socialist world intended to reduce the threat of nucl war.

International detente is also a result of the great efforts of the UN and specialised agencies and committees. The non-aligned movement has ma major contributions to detente. So have sober-minded statesmen a governments, whose efforts are directed towards a peaceful settlement of t most complicated international disputes.

The victory of the cause of peace and national independence in Vietnam, La and Kampuchea, the conclusion of the terrible, inhuman wars that had raged these countries, the overthrow of fascism in Greece and Portugal, the liberati

of the peoples of Angola, Guinea-Bissau and Mozambique from colonial rule have all contributed to the creation of a new international atmosphere. The Helsinki Conference and its Final Act became a powerful stimulus for detente in Europe and inspire peace workers throughout the world. Action by the peace movements has been a powerful factor in assisting the United Nations in deciding to convene a Special Session of the General Assembly on disarmament. This will be a big step towards calling a world disarmament conference.

This is a dependable basis entitling one to look on the prospects of detente with optimism. Peace builders seek to make the year 1977 a turning point in the efforts to end the arms race. The World Assembly of Builders of Peace, to be held in Warsaw from May 6 to 11, will be a most powerful contribution towards this aim.

GERHARD KADE: The Search for Mutally Acceptable Measures

Q. How do you regard the outlook for containing the arms drive?

A. The first steps to contain the arms drive were taken in the early sixties, when detente was only beginning. One of them was the treaty banning nuclear tests in the three spheres. Important measures have been taken since then, for instance, the USSR-USA agreement on limiting strategic arms. These steps have substantially facilitated detente.

Developments over the past few years have proved that, despite the tempestuous progress in science and technology, we can come to an agreement banning the development of certain types of weapons that represent a danger to the very existence of mankind. The arms drive is not consequent on scientific and technological progress. On the contrary, limiting the arms drive would open much wider vistas for the use of science and technology to resolve world-wide problems, notably those of the developing countries.

The material and financial burden of war preparation is now so painfully felt, even in a number of highly developed capitalist countries, that people are asking themselves: Can the accumulated social problems be resolved without disarmament? So far these problems are being exacerbated, largely due to the arms drive. An understanding of that fact (which is gaining ground among ever larger sections of the public) leads to the conviction that the arms drive has to be contained and then halted altogether. It is now becoming perfectly clear that it is not the reduction of armaments production, but the arms drive that is increasing the number of insecure jobs and fostering among white-collar and blue-collar workers apprehension for the future. In the FRG, for example, before the revival of the arms industry, there was practically full employment over a certain period.

Normal relations with the socialist states in the present detente atmosphere would provide new opportunities for co-operation and very broad opportunities for creating secure jobs.

Every step towards disarmament means more security for the whole of society and for each of its members. I feel that the public can help promote detente and disarmament. Our own Committee for Peace, Disarmament and Co-operation wants the public forces brought into motion. But they must clearly see who opposes detente and why.

Q. What about the forces that are trying to block detente and disarmament negotiations?

A. The consequences of the cold war are felt in the FRG, possibly more than in other countries. This finds expression both in politics and ideology. At times one gets the impression that certain political circles even want to revive the cold war, in direct opposition to the Federal government's Eastern policy—its Ostpolitik—which has made a positive contribution to detente in Europe. The reactionary forces are keeping up a steady campaign against it. Hostility to detente is especially apparent in CDU/CSU circles and also in the Bundeswehr.

In keeping with international agreements, the FRG does not have strategic weapons, but there is a dangerous buildup of its military potential. And what is of special concern is not so much the quantitative as the qualitative aspect of this buildup.

Plans for new weapons systems lay a heavy burden on the national budget, with all other budgetary items being steadily reduced. The arms buildup tends to strengthen the elements that want to complicate international relations by boosting the sale of arms. This would cause considerable political and moral damage to the FRG.

In short, FRG citizens have ample reason to reflect on this question: Can a foreign policy be successful if it is based entirely on military strength? In my view, such a policy stands no chance of success. For the Federal Government's Eastern policy has clearly demonstrated that a policy founded on reason and reality is more effective than one oriented on achieving superiority.

Q. Stagnation of the disarmament talks has produced the theory that "detente and the arms drive can coexist". What is your view?

A. The arms drive is bound to narrow the sphere of political action. It is therefore senseless to speak of political detente if there is a continuous buildup of armaments. The lack of confidence and the danger of war, which increase with the increase in weapons and the concentration of military force, could torpedo political detente.

All the countries represented at the Helsinki Conference demonstrated their will to continue the political detente process, and military detente is now a practical proposition. Naturally, no realistic politician will demand a disarmed planet as an immediate goal. The principle of "all or nothing" is least of all applicable to the disarmament problem. In the political sphere, the most important thing is to use all available opportunities to reach reasonable compromises. Since the Helsinki Conference there have appeared realistic preconditions for consolidating detente and for progress in the Vienna negotiations on reducing armed forces and armaments in Central Europe.

Q. What is hampering the success of the Vienna negotiations?

A. We still have to eliminate the lingering distrust between the negotiating powers and work out and discuss proposals acceptable to all. Incidentally, in 1976 the Warsaw Treaty nations submitted new proposals couched in a spirit of reasonable compromise. They take into account a number of points raised by the capitalist countries in December 1975.[1] And yet there has been no progress in Vienna.

In the view of the Warsaw Treaty countries the present military equilibrium in Central Europe must be maintained, with simultaneous reductions of troops and armaments. This is a small but necessary step which, I believe, the capitalist West could accept.

Naturally, reduction of the military confrontation in Europe, which everyone

expects of the Vienna negotiations, will not mean the dismantling of military blocs. But the important thing is that reduction of armaments and armed forces on the continent will substantially reduce the danger of war and thus create the prerequisites for further progress in the political and economic co-operation of [1] European countries, which, in turn, would have a positive effect on detente.

The Vienna negotiations are being impeded by forces that have scant regard for reality and are hampering detente by irrelevant arguments. The imperialist circles that control the mass media play a definite role in this. They are spreading all manner of fabrications about the terrible menace emanating, allegedly, from the Warsaw Treaty countries.

Q. What is the purpose of these fabrications?

A. Though the principle of equilibrium is the very basis of the present negotiations on military matters, the reactionary forces still harp on an imaginary danger from the East. Obviously, they want to compel responsible political circles to accept the arms buildup. This serves the interests, above all, of the military-industrial complex, whose profits are directly dependent on maintaining tension centres. To proposals designed to extend detente and achieve disarmament, the reactionaries counterpose their anti-communist figments. They maintain, for instance, that the East does not really want detente, and, hence, neither disarmament; that the present negotiations are no more than a tactical manoeuvre by the Communists, who are out to gain military superiority. This type of "interpretation" of the disarmament problem has produced a situation in which the capitalist West has no clear-cut concept of comprehensive disarmament negotiations, for anti-communist propaganda is hardly likely to help the success of the negotiations.

Q. Do you think that disarmament negotiations and discussions involve the ideological positions of the countries concerned? Is there any justification for ideological concessions and ideological reconciliation as a condition of disarmament?

A. The disarmament talks do not mean that the FRG has to become a socialist state, or that the socialist camp has to abandon Marxism. Neither the SALT talks between the USA and the USSR, nor the Helsinki negotiations envisage that every country shall renounce its ideological principles. More, it was clearly emphasised that despite ideological differences, common political viewpoints can be worked out, or can be brought closer together through compromise. The measures taken so far have not halted the arms race, but the initial steps indicate that there is ground for useful agreements, even if the parties are motivated by different considerations.

Application of the peaceful co-existence principle is a prerequisite for equality of the parties in disarmament negotiations. He who tries to make ideological reconciliation a prior condition for detente is, objectively, an opponent of detente.

For instance, it would be a gross falsification of the principles accepted at Helsinki to maintain that progress in detente and disarmament are possible only if there is ideological levelling out. My own opinion is that the success of the Helsinki Conference created important preconditions for wider disarmament measures precisely because all its participants pledged to resolve all disputed issues peacefully with respect of the sovereignty of all the parties.

[1] The socialist countries presented new proposals on February 16 and June 10, 1976—*Ed.*

Belgium's Urgent Problems and the Communists' Attitude

ROSINE LEWIN
Editor-in-Chief, *Cahiers Marxistes* magazine, Communist Party of Belgium

TO say that Belgium has not avoided the deep crisis of the capitalist system in the economy, as well as in the social, political and cultural spheres, would be an understatement. At the end of last year there were 250,000 registered fully unemployed, or 8.7 per cent of those on the social security register. Of the Common Market countries, Ireland alone has broken Belguim's record. Those who have remained on the job have to work at an exhausting pace. The employers and the government are deliberately attacking wages, which fail to keep pace with the rising prices. Such major gains of the working class as the principle of bringing wages, salaries and pensions in line with retail prices and that of protection from partial unemployment have to be defended from erosion by the authorities.

The swelling tax burden has not saved the state finances, which are going from bad to worse. A vast number of small and medium enterprises are facing bankruptcy. The policy of austerity which, the government claims, will help overcome the crisis, while it only aggravates it, affects the population at large and has been evoking strong protest, in particular from teachers, scientists and students.

The depth and prolonged nature of the crisis poses fundamental questions. The poll conducted by the public opinion institute in March 1976 has revealed that 40.4 per cent of those questioned (48.6 per cent in Wallonia) think there must be a cardinal change in the economic system in order to overcome the difficulties confronting society.

On top of this, the crisis has shown the urgency of a problem that in Belgium is known as the problem of the communities. This is the problem of the relations between francophonic and Flemish-speaking communities. A new development here is that in the local government elections on October 10 last year three large regions, Wallonia, Flanders and Brussels, voted differently on this question, thereby reaffirming the urgent need for radical institutional reform.[1] The consequences of the problem of the communities and the policy of rigid economy compelled the government in December 1976 to make painstaking and ignominious reshuffles.[2]

Now let us go into the problem of communities in more detail. Belgium's population of almost ten million (9,813,152, Dec. 31, 1975) speaks different languages. The 5.5 million Flemings who live in the north speak Flemish and the 3.25 million Walloons in the south speak French. In the heart of the country the one million inhabitants of Brussels claim that they are neither Flemings nor Walloons. Most of them speak French, some prefer Flemish and many are bilingual. In addition, there are some 60,000 German-speaking people in the eastern provinces.

The problem of the communities is more than a purely linguistic and cultural problem. Its social and economic aspects cannot be resolved today within the

framework of the unitary and centralised system set up by the Belgium bourgeoisie way back in 1831. The problem encouraged the emergence of political organisations—the People's Union (Folksunie) in Flanders, the Walloon Association in the south and the Democratic French-Speaking Front in Brussels—whose initial programmes all contained linguistic demands.

The roots of the regional problem in Belgium, as stated in an article by Claude Renard,[3] are the same as in other countries. Wherever the problem crops up it is made more acute by the cumulative effect of the crisis and the concentration of capital in the hands of the monopolies. But in Belgium this problem acquires a new dimension since Brussels, which is the capital and a region at the same time, is a knot of contradictions, and also because Wallonia and Flanders are not comparable with, say, Tuscany in Italy or with the departments Nord and Pas-de-Calais in France. Although the Walloon region has its geographic boundaries and distinctive culture, Wallonia as part of a future federal state is yet to be created. I repeat, a federal state, since the Communist Party believes that the communities problem can be solved only along the lines of democratic federalism. In the conditions of Belgium, with almost equally important language communities and strictly centralised political structures, federalism may help to avoid a situation in which linguistic problems are a constant source of discord among the populations of various regions. More, federalism is bound to create conditions for broader democracy, because the setting up of elected assemblies with broad powers and executive government bodies in each of the three major regions will bring the decision-making centres closer to the people directly concerned.

The "traditional" parties—the Christian Social Party, the Freedom and Progress Party (Liberals) and even the Socialist Party (at least until recent years)—went slow on this problem for a long time, but its growing acuteness gradually compelled them to start adjusting the unitary structures of the state to the current situation by way of their "cultural" or linguistic separation. This was done first at top level, but without allowing any democratic regional arrangement. For this reason Belgium today has two ministries of education, two ministries of culture and two "councils on cultural affairs", comprising MPs from the two main linguistic communities. On the other hand, regionalisation as such has been blocked by the big bourgeoisie, which is strongly opposed to the granting of genuine rights to Wallonia, Flanders and Brussels.

By widening the gap between regional development levels, the crisis has reaffirmed the urgent need for an acceptable solution to the communities problem within the framework of democratic federalism, combined with structural reforms in the social and economic spheres.

This growing unevenness of development is the result of the structural changes in industry over the past decades. Belgium is an industrial country. It was the first to follow Britain in capitalist industrialisation and since the middle of the 19th century industry has been predominant over farming. Up to World War I, industry, operating on domestic mineral resources, was concentrated mostly in the coal basins of the Walloon provinces, which became centres of coal-intensive industries producing ferrous metal, zinc, glass and ceramics. Later there appeared cement works and big chemical plants turning out nitric fertilisers and other produce. Flanders at that time, with the exception of its textile mills, had

few big industrial enterprises, and its population was engaged mainly agriculture.

The situation has changed completely since then. The discovery of richer cc disposits in Campine, in the north, and especially the construction at the turn the century of the first big machine-building and power engineering enterprises the port district of Antwerp, signalled the start of industrialisation in the Flemi provinces, which rapidly gained momentum. The decreasing role of coal as source of energy later resulted in the closure of nearly all coal centres in Walloni This has hit Wallonia especially hard, as most of its enterprises were traditional industries producing steel, glass, cement, etc. The modern and fa: growing industries (oil and oil products, synthetic chemical materials, moto vehicle assembly, power engineering, electronics) developed mostly in the nort particularly within the Brussels-Antwerp-Ghent triangle.

Now Belgium is no longer divided into industrially advanced Wallonia ai agrarian Flanders. The workers in the Flemish area by far outnumber workers Wallonia. Also Wallonia has suffered most from the crisis: in the Flemish part the country production dropped a mere 3.5 per cent against the 1970 level, wh in the Walloon area, according to the July 1976 statistics, it shrank by 27 per cer

This change in the industrial pattern proceeded parallel with the growi dominance of multinational companies in the Belgium economy. Investments the new industries were made for the most part by foreign companies, more oft American, and also German, French, Dutch, British and others, which eith opened their subsidiaries in Belgium or gained control over big Belgi enterprises like "Ateliers de constructions electriques de Charleroi", which Bar Empain gave up to the Westinghouse company, or Glaverbel, the biggest gla producer in the country, which was taken over by the French BSN compan

Long-term credits, low-interest loans and other government-sponsor fincancial benefits to encourage investment only smoothed the way for forei dominance, a chance which the multinationals did not hesitate to take. Tl subsidiaries of foreign firms received 44 per cent of all credits granted by tl National Industrial Crediting Society between 1966 and 1975.

Already in 1968 the Belgium-based subsidiaries of multinationals we marketing one-third of the output of the country's industrial sector and we employing one-third of the labour. They have a predominant, and at tim absolute, influence in the greater part of the most advanced sectors of tl economy, including motor-vehicle assembly, oil refining, power engineerin electronics, organic chemistry and pharmaceuticals.

The dominance of the multinationals has created a situation in which maj decisions concerning some of the enterprises operating in Belgium are made headquarters functioning uncontrolledly abroad. This renders the economy st more vulnerable, as purely Belgian enterprises, mainly in the tradition industries (ferrous and non-ferrous metallurgy, chemistry, cement, textiles, etc are for the most part turning out semi-finished goods. These goods are hard sell during a recession, because 80 per cent of the exports produced by tl Belgian-Luxembourg alliance is shipped to industrial capitalist countries, whi are also gripped by the crisis. Although one of the most advanced industri countries in the world, Belgium imports more mechines and transport vehicl than it sells abroad.

It is only natural then that in the face of this grave and all-embracing crisis tl

Communist Party focussed the attention of its latest congress (April 1976, Ghent) on the effort to "rally the popular masses to end the crisis". This important congress, which was attended by delegations from many Communist and Workers' parties, set clear-cut political tasks.

The primary task is to gear our policy to the struggle that the working people and their organisations are mounting in reply to the offensive of big capital. The numerous efforts to combat the consequences of the crisis tend to have a unifying effect and often assume wide-scale propositions.

The Belgian working-class movement is known to have long-established militant traditions and to be well organised. The two major trade union organisations—the General Federation of Belgian Labour and the Confederation of Christian Trade Unions— with the overwhelming majority of the working people as their members, have repeatedly taken action as a united front. The proportion of organised labour in the country has reached 67 per cent, which is record high.

The main elements to be stressed in the campaign against the effects of the crisis are, on the one hand, opposition to the attack on the working people's purchasing power and, on the other, efforts to stop the closure of factories and to keep the employment level steady. In their action to keep up employment the workers' organisations often come out against the policies of the multinationals, as was the case at the factories of "Ateliers de constructions electriques de Charleroi", where the campaign was spearheaded against the Westinghouse company; at the Glaverbal works against the French BSN trust; at the Fabelta enterprises against AKZO; and at the Siemens branches against the parent firm. The workers exposed the policies of the multinationals and the government, which granted these companies aid and offered them lucrative orders in return for mere "contractual commitments" in the sphere of employment that have been met only in part. In many cases the workers' action prevented the shutting down of enterprises and massive lay-offs. What is more, it helped them to gain a better understanding of the demands first advanced by the Communist Party, namely: any government action to stimulate the economy (aid, distribution of government contracts etc.) must be backed by precise guarantees that the companies will fulfil their obligations and will be controlled with a view to maintaining industrial potentials and the level of employment.

The Congress in Ghent underscored the significance of these battles, which are already having a limiting effect on the power of monopoly. To carry out the measures planned by the CPB in its "Programme of Urgency", the Party must base itself on this struggle. What are these measures?

In protecting employment: bringing the pension age down to 60 years for men and 55 for women with full pensions paid; cutting down the work week to 36 hours without wage reduction; making any aid to companies and other measures of this kind by the state dependent on the guarantees stipulated in agreements, in order to retain or increase the level of employment; reviving employment in the municipal services; strict observance of the six months' notice of closure of enterprises; transfer of major enterprises owned by multinationals and facing liquidation to the state sector.

In protecting the workers' wages: automatic indexing of taxes for low and medium incomes; a change in the price policy concerning consumer goods produced by monopoly-type enterprises.

In combating the plundering and wasting of state funds: abolition of ta privileges for trusts, strict parliamentary control of the use of state means b private firms and punishment for any gross violation of tax laws.

For Belgian Communists it is perfectly clear that these urgent measur recommended by the Ghent Congress are only the starting point for broad effort to restrict and break the power of monopoly.

The CPB has not yet drawn up a programme for this effort, but the Congre did adopt a document called a "general programme basis for a political union i he near future". This general platform justifies its title in the sense that th proposals formulated by the CPB have managed to combine the hitherto isolate deas that emerged in the large workers' organisations in response to the crisi The main burden of these ideas is that state control should be established ov uch key branches of the economy as power engineering and the granting credits so as to clear the road for an economic policy not tied to crises trends an he drive for profit.

It is evident to the Communists that only this policy, which is daringly ant monopoly, can bring about a drastic change. But we should not forget that th political forces behind this policy are obviously in the minority. The CPB ha substantial influence in some regions and at some large enterprises, but on th national scale its weight is as yet modest. The Belgian Socialist Party (BSP), no the largest political organisation of the working class, still confines itself t purely reformist goals. Since it bcame the opposition in 1974, the BSP has o several occasions assumed firmer positions, but the aims of many of its leade and activists are to regain their place in the government, a government, whic would get the Socialists to join it in crisis management.

Most of the Christian working people, or about half of all wage earners, st show confidence in the Christian Social Party, especially in its Flemish wing, th Catholic People's Party, which enjoys influence in the north. Many leaders that party and even its spokesmen in parliament consider themselves to be part the labour Christian-Democratic movement, but its political orientation mainly in the interests of the big bourgeoisie.

Although it has spread all across the country, the opposition to the policy rigid economy has been impaired by the vacillation of a part of the working-cla and democratic movement still influenced by a variety of trends of Socialist an Christian reformism. This oppostion has no clear programme and policy for government and parliamentary majority that would want to follow a differe course. Louis Van Geyt, Chairman of the Communist Party, stressed this at th 22nd Congress of the CPB: "The main weakness of the opposition to the policy crises is political weakness, which is the result, above all, of the fact that the le opposition on the whole (to the extent to which traditional reformist views sti prevail there) has failed so far to offer the working-class movement and th country an effective alternative."

The local government elections on October 10, 1976, did not register the "shi to the left" which the action to protect employment and a certain consolidation forces in reply to the policy of rigid economy had allowed us to hope fo Therefore the task today is to double our effort and achieve a new alliance of th workers and democratic forces, which is the only way to convince the masses th this alternative to the policy of crises and rigid economy will prove effective an the desired changes are attainable.

In addition to the slogan of "rallying the masses to end the crisis", the Ghent ›ngress reminded Party members that the goal is to develop democracy "to the most" and in this way to build socialism. This goal will be attained in a struggle ıich will crush the power of monopoly. It had been pointed out at earlier ngresses that socialism in Belgium could be only pluralistic and democratic. nriched by the entire experience of the international working-class ›vement," declared the 19th BCP Congress (1968, Ostend), "the Belgian ›rking-class movement will chart its own way to socialism proceeding from the :cific historical conditions in our country". In his report to the 22nd Congress, : Chairman of our Party said on that score: "This socialism, insofar as it pends on workers and democratic forces, will be a 'Belgian' type of socialism, d will be achieved by democratic and peaceful means, through a democratic d peaceful winning of power by the working class and its allies. This implies the ed to win over the majority of the population and, consequently, the voters, to : idea of a socialist transformation of society . . . 'Belgian' socialism will have a litical system based on consolidating and spreading to all spheres the mocratic freedoms (incomplete, of course, but, nevertheless, real), which the ›rkers and all popular forces have been able to secure or retain under the power the big bourgeoisie. Therefore this system will be (I repeat, insofar as it pends on workers and democratic forces) the kind of system that is wanted by ırkers, democrats and the vast majority of the Belgian population."

To sum up, democracy "to the utmost" will give rise to a socialist society that l be built with due attention to our country's specific historical features, a :iety nurtured by the struggles of all its active forces, a society desired by the jority of the population. But before that, we have to go through a number of ges, always basing ourselves on the activity of the working-class and nocratic movements: the struggle to maintain and increase employment, raise purchasing power of the masses, extend the rights of trade unions and ensure servance of democratic norms at the level of a residential district, community d region; the struggle to democratise the education system, culture, health vice and territorial planning; the struggle to end discrimination against men. The first set of structural reforms proposed by the CPB to the other ces in the working-class and democratic movements (a limited, but not lated set) should also be viewed in this context.

't is a limited proposal, of course, but this does not detract from the nificance of its objective. It is the start of the anti-monopoly stage and is aimed unifying and tying in with the actual political prospect the most progressive as concerning structural reform, ideas which have up to now been proposed latedly in large organisations of workers. This proposal is aimed at imparting ›olitical direction and nation-wide scope to the courageous actions of the rking people, which sometimes lack foresight and are isolated. It is aimed also ıchieving a successful continuation of the struggle, which will at last be united a joint programme for ending the crisis, and promises anti-monopoly action. :alls for patient and well considered effort, so that in the foreseeable future the lk of the workers and democratic forces could be in a position to form a vernment majority of a different kind, its aim being not management of crisis, t an end to the policy of crises.

The local government election returns revealed that Belgium is split into three parts, each having a ıtical face of its own: Wallonia is dominated by Socialists, in Flanders the Social-Christian Party

continued overleaf

has gained a foothold and in Brussels nationalistic francophonic sentiments have got the upper
Since the election the Tindemans government has been in difficulties because in order to
through drastic economic reforms it needs the support of all three regions.—*Ed.*

[2] The new cabinet (formed Dec. 8, 1976) won a vote of confidence in the lower house by the n
margin of 110 against 90, with 3 abstentions.— *Ed.*

[3] *Cahiers Marxistes*, April 1976.

The Patriots of Paraguay will be Victorious

AT the end of January 1977, Chairman of the Paraguayan Communist P
Antonio Maydana and Central Committee members Julio Rojas and Alf
Alcorta, were released, along with some other Political prisoners, after 19 y
in prison.

The staunchness, courage and boundless devotion to the ideas of Marx
Leninism and the interests of the people of Paraguay that they displayed in al
years of imprisonment have earned them respect throughout the world. T
release by the Stroessner dictatorship is a big victory for the people of Parag
and the worldwide solidarity movement with their heroic struggle, to w
World Marxist Review also contributed.

However, hundreds of political prisoners still remain in Paraguayan jails
concentration camps, and the leaders of the Communist Party are under c
police surveillance and the constant threat of repression.

World Marxist Review conveys its warmest congratulations to the leade
the Paraguayan Communist Party on their release and supports demands o
progressive world public that the Paraguayan authorities grant full freedo
the Communist Party leaders and all political prisoners and that all persecu
of patriots and democrats in Paraguay be stopped.

New Horizons in Nigeria

DAPO FATOGUN

Editor-in-Chief, *New Horizon*, Nigerian Marxist journal

**THE eventful history of Nigeria since she won political independence in
mirrors deep-going social and economic processes. Since that date, there l
been a popular insurrection in Western Nigeria, a civil war in the eastern pa
the country and pogroms in the north; there have been three coups, t
development plans, massive industrialisation and a series of anti-imperi
economic programmes—these are but a few elements of the fast-changing s
development in Nigeria in the years of her sovereign existence.**

**The civil war was part of the imperialist countries' attempt to "balkanise'
largest state in Africa. They failed, thanks to the heroic effort of the peop
Nigeria, and the timely co-operation of the Soviet Union and other soci
countries.**

After the civil war ended in 1970, changes in Nigeria were more rapid and of a :arer class character. The people had become more united and powerful in their uggle against imperialist conspiracies. The civil war raised considerably the el of the people's political consciousness. Nigeria's firm anti-imperialist stand the Angola issue and her active support for all liberation movements in uthern Africa have been applauded by progressives the world over.

How did these positive changes mature? What are the prospects and problems the further social and economic advance of Nigeria? To properly appreciate change in Nigeria's political horizon, we need to look back into the recent st.

Heritage of the Past

Nigeria was born as an administrative entity in 1914, when the British colonial thorities at the time merged two socially and ethnically different territories orthern and Southern Nigeria) into one. The merger was meant to improve the lonial administration of such a vast territory with a relatively large population. e Northern sector had, for many decades, been in trading and cultural contact h the Arab world and had, in consequence, been largely influenced by the ab-Islamic civilisation. The influence persisted when the British moved in and onised it later. The Southern sector, on the other hand, was exposed for :ades to the influence of the Euro-Christian culture and religion.[1]

So, Nigeria's biggest problem since its emergence as an administrative entity in 14 has been to remove the religious and cultural barriers in the way of national eration during British colonial rule. When the colonialists left, the problem w more acute due to the manoeuvres of British colonial authorities on the eve independence. In keeping with their "divide and rule" strategy, they kept alive embers of religious strife.

n addition to the problem of two rival religions and two unidentical ilisations, the newly created amalgam, called "Nigeria", was also a hub of fifty verse tongues" and tribes. Before the British imperialists handed power over their native stooges in Nigeria in 1960, they set a booby-trap of tribal ntradictions into the edifice of Nigerian statehood. They pitched the three in tribal groups (Hausa, Yorubas and Ibos) against one another. They created hree-region loose federation where a little inter-tribal spark could cause a itical conflagration. Each of the three regions was a veritable tribal empire of own.

The long European presence in the southern regions of the country and their orous drawing onto the world market, which resulted in trade development, re among the major causes of the rapid emergence of the national bourgeoisie. e building of workshops and factories made for the growth of the working ss and the middle strata. The spread of school education helped raise the eral level of political consciousness. All this could not but weaken the power he feudal lords in the South. In the Northern region, the reverse was the cause ause the impact of the Arab-Islamic civilisation with its peculiar effect on ial development, and because of the limited market relations, and the power autocratic princes and emirs remained in the region due to the deeply rooted dal relationships.

When the British colonialists handed power to their stooges, they pinned their pes on religious strife and a power struggle between the feudal elite in the

Early last year, the military government set up a judicial tribunal to examine, among other things, the slanderous charges concerning the reliance on "foreign ideology and finance" of each of the four trade union organisations that formed the new United Congress.

Although the Federal Military Government of Nigeria has adopted a number of very progressive, anti-imperialist resolutions and policies, especially in matters related to Southern Africa, it has always taken a "no socialism, no capitalism" stance at home, which is reflected also in its attitude to the trade unions. A reason often given by some members of the Armed Forces is that the military government, being a transitional regime, should leave the choice of ideology to the future civilian government.

This ideological uncertainty affects, in a degree, economic policy, although the military regime has achieved certain success here. After the civil war, the rate of economic activity increased four-fold. The Second Development Plan (1970-74) boosted the country's GNP. The efforts of the administration in the new states[2] to activise their economies resulted in a notable industrial growth, which was followed by a fast increase in the number of wage-earning workers, from about 350,000 at the time when the country was proclaimed independent to almost 3,000,000 at the present time. The figure is expected to reach 5,000,000 with the fulfilment of the Third Development Plan (1975-80).

In scope and investment, the Third Plan is the most ambitious. It provides for 30,000 million naira's worth of investment against the N2,200 million of the first plan (1962-68) and N3,000 million of the second plan. Provisions have been made for an annual industrial growth rate of 9 per cent against 4 and 6.6 of the First and Second plans respectively. The top priorities of the new plan include such giant projects as an iron and steel complex and a number of other big projects of the infrastructure. A key role in their construction is played by co-operation with the Soviet Union. The USSR will also co-operate in the installation of oil pipelines, introduction of new technology in the oil and chemical industries and the training of technical personnel.

Rapid industrialisation and subsequent urbanisation accentuate the problem of food production, and the plan envisages measures to boost agriculture and increase the harvesting of food crops by expanding the sown areas. But the social implications of the government food policy are not yet clear. The military government, which regards itself a transient regime, does not wish to change the land tenure system and, in general, to interfere in the existing agrarian relationships. Meanwhile the peasantry, still under the yoke of semi-feudal exploitation, is anxiously awaiting a positive programme which would improve its condition.

Choice of Path

The present military government has given notice of its determination to step down in October 1979. One of the current tasks is to get a new constitution written. Its draft was prepared in 1975 by a 49-man civilian committee, most of the members holding conservative views.

In the opinion of our Party, the draft is mainly in the interests of the bourgeoisie. Its aim is to protect the propertied classes and encourage capitalism. The very few progressive-minded committee members insisted that the Constitution should positively take a socialist position. Their suggestions were

rejected. But the Constituent Assembly, most of whose members will come from local government bodies, will cast the final vote on the type of Constitution we will have. The local elections of December 1976 brought a number of socialists and progressives into the Constituent Assembly so there is hope of more positive results.

In saying so, we are confident that the Constituent Assembly cannot ignore the obvious and growing tendency among the broad popular masses to choose the socialist path. The tendencies of Nigeria's social development are acquiring a special significance in view of our country's role in the African continent. Indeed, in population (nearly 80 million), wealth in resources, and skilled manpower, Nigeria is considered to be a giant in Africa and the direction of its social development cannot but largely influence other African countries.

The imperialists are all out to block Nigeria's turn towards a socialist orientation. Now they rely increasingly on the Nigerian bourgeoisie to oppose the progressive forces when the civilian government will be taking over. Furthermore, imperialists and their local allies are trying hard to cultivate in our country various ideas of "national" or "autonomous" pseudo-socialism and anti-internationalist sentiments. But the working people, who have come through the grim experience of struggle against imperialist conspiracies, are fully aware that only a clear-cut programme based on principles of scientific socialism can promote peace and unity in the country and resolve all the dangerous contradictions that once brought tribal revolts, pogroms and the civil war.

Nigerian Marxists-Leninists are today confronted with many difficulties and enemies. But we are optimistic, first because of the people's will; the working class, as well as working people in general, are for the choice of non-capitalist development. Second because of the decisive change in the world balance of forces in favour of socialism and the continuous growth in strength of its greatest bastion—the USSR. And, lastly, our faith in the correctness and invincibility of the principles of scientific socialism and the teachings of Marxism-Leninism, the unfading beacon illuming the path of revolutionary change to all the peoples.

[1] *Moslem and Christian missionaries in Nigeria had one feature in common: together with the feudal aristocrats and colonial authorities they exploited the population.*

[2] *The country's four tribally-based administrative regions were rearranged after the war into 12 semi-autonomous states.*

For an End to Anti-Communism

GERARD GATINOT

Secretary-General of the French National Union of Journalists and Vice-Presidents of the IOJ

Work and Plans of Democratic Journalists

At the recent Conference of the International Organisation of Journalists (IOJ) in Helsinki, *World Marxist Review* staff member Vitaly Petrusenko asked several delegates of differing political views to comment on the struggle against anti-communism, the attitude to existing socialism and solidarity with national-liberation movements.

OUR journalists' union (it includes Communists, Socialists, Christians, non-affiliated and others) differs from other French media professional unions in that its work is based on class principles. We belong to the General Confederation of Labour (CGT), the largest French trade union organisation with a membership of 2.5 million, including the printing industry. Our union's basic task is to defend the professional rights of journalists, but we do not hold aloof from the political struggle. Our union has approved and supports the Common Programme of the French left parties and urged its members to vote for the candidates of the left forces.

In the autumn of 1976 the CGT initiated a nation-wide action week in which many journalists' unions and organisations of printing workers, TV and radio technicians took part. There is an urgent need for joint action because, of the 14,000 French journalists, approximately 1,800 are out of work and others are being fired on the pretext of "economy". We have to fight for jobs and higher wages, against political pressure on the press by the government right wing, against concentration of the media in the hands of a small group of businessmen who are supported by the banks. And, in our efforts, we come up against various manifestations of anti-communism.

For instance, at our trade union congress in February 1974 one of the speakers demanded that the Communists be expelled from the union leadership. And, although the Communists were in the minority at the congress, it was the anti-Communists who were expelled, not the Communists, many of whom were re-elected to keyposts. Our union Rules say nothing about waging a struggle against anti-communism, but all our actions in encouraging journalists to be objective, are organically a part of the struggle against anti-communism.

For us this struggle means daily efforts for truthful information, for an objective press, that Frenchmen have longed for since the days of the struggle for the country's liberation.

It is not easy for one who works in the monopoly-controlled media to declare openly that he is a Communist, and members of the unions affiliated to the CGT also find it difficult to hold their jobs in the bourgeois press, for Communist journalists are the first to be fired, are discriminated against and are not easily promoted. This does not intimidate them, however, and they demand their professional rights and stand up for their ideas. In the *Nouvelle Republique* (Tours), for example, a group of journalists and printers have formed a Communist group and they protest to the management whenever an anti-Communist article appears. This group publishes its own newspaper with a column exposing anti-communism, criticising the *Nouvelle Republique* for its attacks on the Communist Party and exposing slanderous and biased material.

Such opposition to anti-communism is effective for it attracts the attention of many journalists. Ever more French journalists holding a wide range of political views are joining the struggle for objective and truthful information and for freedom of opinion. As a result, many of them reach the same conclusion as we, that it is necessary to fight against anti-communism in the press, and for a free press.

JOE WALKER

New York editor of the Chicago *Bilalian News*

OUR weekly is the paper of Black Muslims and is the largest newspaper of the Afro-American people in the United States. We write about the life and concerns

of this part of the population. And speaking about these concerns, I think statements about the black people being basically conservative and basically anti-Communist, are wrong.[1] And I don't think that they ever have been really, even during the cold war when communism was a bogey in my country, certainly much more so than now. Judging by the mood of the black people today, they are against the system existing in our country.

The black people in the USA are concerned with what is happening in Southern Africa. Afro-Americans are wholly for black majority rule in Namibia, Zimbabwe and South Africa itself. What happened in Angola helped the black people to understand the international role played by the Soviet Union and Cuba. The supply of arms from the Soviet Union, and the fact that Cuba was willing to have troops go there at the request of the Angolan government to aid our Angolan brothers in their fight against the aggressor from South Africa—all this has broadened the people's minds as to what socialism means in the world today and I think this registered favourably in the minds of my people.

As for the question of detente, the black press, by and large, has a more realistic, more progressive attitude than the establishment[2] media in the sense that it wants to see greater detente in the world. The results that have come out of the Helsinki Conference on European Security and Co-operation are welcome on the pages of the black press. Detente is enlarging relations between different countries, and opening up the information blockade that the United States has erected around major countries abroad, particularly around the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries.

Many of our journalists have a growing distrust for the official press handouts from Washington because there have been so many lies about US foreign policy.

In recent years I have had the opportunity of meeting with colleagues from the Soviet Union and other socialist countries. And this has added to my understanding of how the press and other media function there and the excellent training journalists receive. I see more clearly now that Soviet society is an open society despite US propaganda claims that it is a "closed society". I am impressed with the method of information distribution in Soviet newspapers, and its purpose of showing people how to better their lives, explain what is happening at home and in other countries, how the Soviet Union is extending aid to peoples' struggling for their independence.

Unfortunately, US journalists have been cut off for too long from progressive journalists in other parts of the world. However, there is an eagerness for contacts with the outside world, to expand contacts with progressive journalists from the radical press, the labour press, the college press and even from the establishment press. "Anti-communist mythology," says James Aronson, an authority on the US mass media, "no longer has a grip on the working members of the US communications industry."

REINALDO RAMIREZ

Secretary, Colombian Federation of Journalists and Press Workers

IN the forties, at the peak of the cold war, Colombia's reactionaries, on the pretext of fighting communism, started a campaign of terror during which hundreds of thousands of Colombians lost their lives. The left, democratic press was one of the first to suffer from this violence. The Communist Party paper *Diario Popular* was outlawed and its printing shop raided and destroyed. But,

although the Party went underground, it continued illegal publication. At the onset of the sixties the Black Hand (Mano Negra) organisation appeared in the country, similar to the John Birch Society in the United States. It was instrumental in shutting down several democratic newspapers, including the *Gaceta, Calle* and *Nueva Prensa,* by forcing private companies to stop advertising in these papers. This, together with the terror of the forties shows that the democratic forces and also that part of the bourgeoisie defending national interests, can suffer from anti-communism.

The capitalist press, radio and television continue their anti-Communist campaigns today also. But, anti-communism is opposed by the democratic and patriotic movement which is beginning to gain positions in elected bodies. The Communist and democratic press is fighting anti-communism and, increasingly, journalists of the bourgeois press, radio and television are determined to be more objective and work in the people's interests.

The National Federation of Journalists and Press Workers was formed recently in Colombia, uniting 8 journalists' trade unions with a membership of two thousand. It aims to give the people the truth, to establish a truly free press. And this is incompatible with the right of anyone to manipulate the media and control the people's thinking. Colombia's democratic journalists are fighting against those who control the press, against reactionary political forces and against any imperialist interference in Colombia's internal affairs. Many times they have exposed right-wing journalists who are in the pay of the CIA and who use material from US information agencies to misinform the people and give them a distorted picture of life in the socialist countries.

Democratic journalists should not forget that fascism has not yet been fully defeated, that it is still active and remains a weapon of imperialist reaction. The people of Chile and of other Latin American countries suffer from the fascist crimes. Many journalists have been tortured in jails in Chile, Uruguay, Guatemala, Brazil, Paraguay, Haiti, Puerto Rico, Bolivia, the Dominican Republic and other countries on the continent. The Assembly of Latin American journalists held in Mexico in 1976, expressed its solidarity with fraternal journalists—victims of repression forced to live in exile. The Assembly founded the Latin American Federation of Journalists (FELAP) committed to the international struggle for peace, democracy and freedom, against reaction and exploitation. This organisation which has laid the foundations of united action by journalists of the continent, will, I believe, help to strengthen the struggle against anti-communism.

MARIEMUTHOO NAIKER

Editor of *Sechaba,* organ of the African National Congress (South Africa)

HONEST journalists in South Africa are victims of oppression and persecution. One of the reasons why many of us are in exile is because we have consistently opposed the anti-communist policies and ideology of the racist regime.[3]

One of the more vicious forms of anti-communism is anti-Sovietism which manifests itself in efforts to block the strengthening of friendly and mutually advantageous relations between African countries and the Soviet Union and to diminish co-operation between them, to deprive the newly independent countries of the much needed support coming from the socialist community. Using the pretext of fighting "Communist expansion", international imperialism would

like to preserve the racist regimes in South Africa and Rhodesia, protect the interests of the monopoly multinational companies operating in South Africa and justify the new US naval bases in this region and in the Indian Ocean. Not to struggle against anti-communism and anti-Sovietism means allowing imperialism and racism to continue their colonial and neo-colonial policies in Africa.

With regard to this I should like to quote chief Luthuli, former ANC President and Nobel Peace Prize winner. Asked by US journalists, what he thought of the Communists in the ANC he said: "Yes, we have Communists and I hope we shall have a few more because they are the hardest working people I have found, they are most reliable and, as far as I am concerned, so long as they support the struggle for the national democratic revolution, they can be good Communists as well."

Regretably, communism is used as a red herring to divert even some African leaders from the main problems existing in Southern Africa such as economic support for apartheid by international imperialism. Realism in such questions now is of special importance. And that is why honest journalists cannot and must not tolerate anti-communism. Otherwise, how can they be objective, how can they contribute to the efforts for detente and social progress?

In such colonial and oppressed countries as South Africa, the national-liberation struggle is part of the struggle for detente and peaceful coexistence because the national-liberation forces are for peace, they are for life. But, some people ask: "How is it that you, a revolutionary, are for disarmament and detente?" The answer to this I think is that there is no difference between the struggle for disarmament, for detente and for national liberation. The fight for disarmament means disarming the forces of war and, in our region, the racist regimes, it means helping the forces of peace in Africa. Reactionary Western journalists portray Vorster as something of a strategist of peaceful coexistence in Africa. The Soweto uprising showed how wrong this is. I was in Britain during the uprising and it is true that the British press tried to confuse the public into thinking that this was no more than a spontaneous uprising. However, there were some journalists in Britain who saw this as something much more than a spontaneous burst of indignation. They saw it as an overall struggle and many had to admit that it was inspired by the African National Congress and the South African Communist Party as an overall struggle against apartheid, for the overthrow of the Vorster racist regime.

JOSE LEITAO

Head of the Central Department, Ministry of Information, People's Republic of Angola

THE imperialists are continuing their acts of aggression against Angola. There are border provocations by the South African racists and their supporters. The organisation is being openly discussed of an aggressive military bloc in the South Atlantic. On the economic side, many capitalist countries continue boycotting Angola. The imperialist-controlled press continually tries to put pressure on Angola by a psychological war under the flag of combating communism. Attempts are made to isolate us from other African countries and to portray Angola as being under "foreign influence". All manner of fabrications are published about the Angolan people and the country's leaders to create an

atmosphere of instability and uncertainty in the country. Of course, Angola is not the only country to feel the pressure of the imperialists and their media. In order to neutralise the efforts of reaction it is necessary to expose the true motives of the enemies of peace and progress and show the imperialist and neocolonialist essence of anti-communism. This is not a passing struggle, it must be continued without let-up by all progressive and democratic journalists. It is our duty to stand up for the truth, to fight together against the biased and false imperialist distortions of the events and processes taking place in countries the world over.

Angolan journalists must replace the old, colonialist system of information with a system that would be in the people's interests. This is not a simple matter for the colonialists left Angola a population that is 90 per cent illiterate and has to rely on the radio as the only source of information. It was not easy but we managed to restore radio communications destroyed by the retreating colonialists. We have also repaired many printing shops and have started publishing newspapers. In Luanda today there are two government and one party newspaper; there are likewise smaller papers put out at enterprises, in city neighbourhoods and in some of the provinces. All bring the people the ideas of the revolution, explain the essence of the economic, social and political problems that are being resolved by the people under the leadership of the MPLA.

* * *

All those who were interviewed made special mention of the fact that the struggle against anti-communism, anti-Sovietism, for international solidarity with the national-liberation, anti-imperialist movements had become an important part of the work of democratic and progressive journalists. It is closely bound up with a desire that has become particularly apparent in recent years, to be honest and objective in reporting world events, the struggle of all progressive humanity for peace and security, detente and disarmament, for social progress and the new life.

---

[1] For example *Newsweek* writer Stanley Karnow claims that the black US population is basically "conservative and rigidly anti-Communist". *Newsweek*, September 13, 1976.—*Ed.*

[2] Establishment, a term used to identify the ruling topcrust of state-monopoly capital. Establishment media is usually applied to the media controlled by the monopoly bourgeoisie.—*Ed.*

[3] The Vorster regime has arrested 15 South African journalists for writing objectively about the events in Soweto and other parts of the country. In September and November 1976 journalists Dr. David Rabkin and Anthony Holliday were sentenced to 10 years and six years of imprisonment respectively for, among other things, spreading the ideas of the banned South African Communist Party and the African National Congress.—*Ed.*

Protecting Natural Resources and Fighting for National Independence

International Symposium in Havana Sponsored by "WMR" in Collaboration with the CC CP of Cuba

Latin America has lately been the scene of a growing movement to end imperialist monopoly control of the continent's economy and establish national control over natural resources. This is seen in demands made by the most diverse social and political forces and in the activity of some governments.

"Protection of Natural Resources: An Instrument in the Struggle for National Independence" was the theme of an international symposium in Havana sponsored by *WMR* in collaboration with the CC, Communist Party of Cuba. The symposium brought together, as we have reported, representatives of Communist and Workers' parties and progressive opinion from Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Cuba, Ecuador, Guatemala, Honduras, Mexico, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Puerto Rico, Uruguay and Venezuela.

Following is a brief account of the symposium. A fuller account will appear in a book to be brought out in Russian and Spanish by Peace and Socialism International Publishers.

THE symposium was opened by *Isidoro Malmierca*, member of the CC Secretariat, Communist Party of Cuba, who conveyed greetings from Fidel Castro, Cuba's Communists and the Cuban people. Our Party leadership, he said, welcomed the proposal of *World Marxist Review* to hold this symposium in Cuba. Its theme is highly topical. The economic crisis in the capitalist world tells strongly on the underdeveloped countries. It is becoming more and more important for the peoples to exercise undivided sovereignty over their natural resources, utilise them judiciously and protect the environment. "The world as a whole," said Fidel Castro at the First Congress of our Party, "is beginning to meet serious obstacles in view of the limitations of traditional energy resources, the progressing exhaustion of mineral deposits, environmental pollution, a considerable growth of the population, whose subsistence is already precarious in some areas, and a dearth of flood. Naturally, these problems are aggravated by the uneven development of nations and by a monstrous waste of natural resources in the capitalist consumer society."

Marxism-Leninism has demonstrated, I. Malmierca continued, that the solution of the problem of resources will only be made possible by far-reaching political and economic changes eliminating today's deformed social structures and determining the right strategy for social and economic development. The road to progress leads through protection of natural resources, a radical agrarian reform, control over finances, incomes redistribution in the interest of the working people, and a genuinely independent policy.

The Cuban example shows that measures of this nature are the first step in the gigantic amount of work that must be done to end the age-old backwardness inherited from the period of colonial and neocolonial exploitation.

Cuba continues to enjoy the solidarity and disinterested assistance of socialist countries, first of all the Soviet Union. Without that, the gains and achievements of our revolution would virtually have been impossible. They contrast sharply with the situation in which most Latin American nations find themselves.

"Penetration by multinational consortiums," says the declaration of the Conference of Communist Parties of Latin America and the Caribbean, "has introduced into certain branches of Latin American agriculture modern forms of exploitation that also constitute a new method of extracting our natural resources and making us still more dependent on US monopoly capital."

FAO research has revealed that agricultural production, which is vital to the peoples of Latin America, is doomed to stay at one and the same level. Its growth indices are so insignificant as to be unable to meet even minimal food requirements of the population.

At the same time, oil, bauxites, copper, tin, iron ore and other natural resources of the continent are an object of foreign monopoly plunder. Latin America's peoples get very little from the utilisation of the resources of their own countries.

That was also the situation in Cuba before the victory of the revolution. It was characterised by a lopsided economy, meagre productive forces, a weak industry, extensive farming hardly using machinery, a shortage of technological and managerial personnel, unemployment, illiteracy, hunger and poverty.

To put the nation's riches in the people's service, the Revolutionary Government passed agrarian reform and nationalisation laws, with the result that the state established control over virtually all foreign investments in the country, as well as over major enterprises of the bourgeoisie linked with imperialism, and introduced state monopoly of foreign trade.

In spite of a backward economy, a criminal blockade imposed by the US imperialists, every manner of aggression against our revolution and the scarcity of natural resources, Cuba has made notable social and economic gains. Nevertheless, it will yet take us much effort to fulfil the economic plans we have laid for the years ahead.

In *Dialectics of Nature*, Engels pointed to the harmful consequences of the exploiting classes' predatory utilisation of natural resources. He referred, in particular, to the destruction of Cuba's forests on mountain slopes with the aim of growing coffee. "What cared they," Engels wrote, "that the heavy tropical rainfall afterwards washed away the unprotected upper stratum of the soil, leaving behind only bare rock!"[1]

Engels wrote those lines in 1876. It took our people almost a century, during which they fought first against Spanish colonial rule and then against neocolonial oppression by the US imperialists, to set about building a new life free from exploitation. We are now in a position to restore our forests, protect nature and make wise use of our natural resources. We can do all this because we have removed the principal political, social and economic obstacles on our road. Our entire activity serves the interests of the working people and is

aimed at improving their life. People are our country's greatest asset. They are being educated according to new spiritual values and in line with Marxist-Leninist principles. It is for their good and happiness that the revolution is being carried on.

Imperialism and Monopoly Are the Chief Enemy

Drawing on a wealth of statistical data in analysing the social and economic situation in various countries and on the continent as a whole, participants in the symposium showed that US imperialism is the main plunderer of Latin America's natural resources. Plunder and reckless exploitation of raw material resources are typical of the US monopolies' activity in the region.

Argentina, said *Alberto Kohen*, member of of the *WMR* Editorial Board, has untold natural wealth, but it is in the hands of foreign monopolies, of a handful of big capitalists. These riches are recklessly exploited or lie unused. The criterion of the attitude to natural resources is not the country's national interest but the amount of superprofit made by monopolies. Argentina is still dependent on imperialism; it is a country with a backward, unevenly developed economy, which breeds irrational methods of economic management. It gets over 85 per cent of its electricity by burning oil, coal and gas, although it is very rich in hydropower resources, which it did not begin to utilise until recently owing to the resistance of foreign companies. The raw material requirements of industry are met largely with imports because imperialist monopolies block the working of the country's own rich mineral deposits.

To give an idea of the plunder resulting from foreign capitalist domination, suffice it to say that from 1966 to 1974, $2,813.6 million in dividends, brokerage and profits from foreign investments was taken out of Argentina whereas direct investments stood at a mere $86.6 million.

Monopoly capital's tendency to use other countries' natural resources at will has always been a source of war danger, said *Antonio Diaz Ruiz*, head of department, CC CP of Cuba. Fidel Castro pointed to this important aspect of the problem in receiving the International Lenin Peace Prize. "Capitalism and its higher stage—imperialism," he said, "develop primarily by exploiting the labour of other peoples, the natural resources of other countries, and the labour of the workers and other propertyless classes of their own peoples."

Due to the people's growing struggle for liberation from imperialist tyranny," said *Rogelio Gonzalez*, CC member, Paraguayan Communist Party, "the monopolies' sphere of domination is shrinking. This is why they are out to lay hands on the riches of countries still under their control. They are helped in this by dictatorial regimes put in power by imperialism. The US Anschutz Corp, has secured from the venal Stroessner government a concession for a term of 40 years to explore and work mineral resources, on 43 per cent of the national territory. Not long ago, the corporation announced that it had found uranium in the Ka'acupe area. Of the net profit to be made by the corporation, the Paraguayan state will get a meagre three to five per cent, nor will the corporation pay any taxes.

Leopoldo Bruera, Executive Committee member, CC CP of Uruguay, stressed that the establishment of fascist regimes in several Latin American countries has made those countries still more dependent on imperialism. The financial oligarchy, the most powerful latifundium-holders and the big com-

mercial bourgeoisie of Uruguay try to preserve and consolidate antiquated social and economic structures, allow foreign monopoly capital full play and transfer government enterprises to private ownership. The dictatorship has sold or mortgaged its gold reserves, made a shameful deal by putting foreign trade under the control of foreign capital, helped the latter to purchase banks, land and industrial enterprises and transferred a number of branches in the state sector (electrical engineering, communications) to private capital.

We consider, said *Alfonso Bauer Pais*, former Minister of the Economy and Labour of Guatemala, that the problem of utilising natural resources is closely linked with problems of national independence. Guatemala is virtually an occupied country. Its natural resources are either owned or controlled in one way or another by foreigners, first of all North Americans. Oil and nickel, the country's key resources, have been put at the disposal of multinationals. A score of oil companies have acquired the right to drill for oil on an area exceeding three million acres. In north-eastern Guatemala, US monopoly capital works mineral deposits, including cobalt, chromium and possibly uranium. Some estimates set the amount invested in the project at about $250 million, which is more than the rest of direct US investments in Guatemala.

The overthrow of the popular government and the establishment of a fascist regime, said *Rodrigo Rojas*, Political Commission member, CC CP of Chile, threw the development of our country many years back. They brought on runaway inflation, unemployment, poverty and hunger, to say nothing of barbarous terror. The fascist junta is restoring monopoly and landowner domination. Imperialism is getting back nationalised branch companies, which are paid enormous indemnities, as was the case with the copper companies and ITT. Foreign capital is granted easements it never had before. The junta's economic policy is making the country more dependent on US imperialism, strengthening the positions of financial capital and ruining medium and small owners. The fascist regime undermines the fundamental policy principles of countries trying to protect their natural resources and establishing control over the activity of multinational companies.

The dictatorship's economic policy, said *Julio Benitez*, CC member, Socialist Party of Chile, is a strategic model supplied by the monopoly bourgeoisie and imperialism. The purpose is to prevent a re-emergence of social, economic and political conditions such as those that led to the formation of the Popular Unity government, and on the other hand, to vitalise a system guaranteeing monopoly capitalist and imperialist domination. It is becoming one of the main functions of the fascist government to turn over highly important resources to imperialism and shift the Chilean economy to the private sector. Everything is done to justify concessions to foreign capital and further the monopolisation of the economy. The regime has approved rules for foreign investment that remove obstacles to foreign monopoly penetration into the national economy.

Imperialism, said *Pedro Pablo Barauna*, CC member, Brazilian CP, tried for years to "prove" that Brazil lacks any considerable natural resources and held back their exploitation, dooming the country to the fate of an essentially agrarian country. In the sixties, specialists invited from the Soviet Union

ascertained the size of Brazil's oil deposits by strictly scientific methods. This meant that the country could look forward to meeting its oil requirements in the foreseeable future. Imperialist monopolies, above all those of the United States, did not relish the prospect. Steps to set up a national oil industry and other measures of the Brazilian government of the time intended to protect national interests were among the causes of a reactionary coup. The transfer of oil-fields to foreign companies was one of the military fascist dictatorship's early measures. The new regime's policy was designed to denationalise the oil industry more and more. Petrobras, the state oil company, has become an enterprise refining imported oil. It finances oil prospecting and extraction in other countries and as for utilising the nation's own raw materials, it has been relegated to a secondary place. At the same time, the company signs contracts with multinational companies for oil prospecting on the continental shelf.

The country's natural resources today are used by imperialist monopolies for drawing up and carrying out plans of armed aggression against the popular movement on the continent. Radioactive minerals, first of all uranium and thorium, find themselves in the hands of West German monopolies, with whose aid Brazil wants to manufacture nuclear weapons. Iron ore and manganese are widely used by a fast-growing military industrial complex, which already delivers arms and other military supplies to other dictatorial regimes of Latin America.

Ever since the beginning of this century, said *Efrain Alvarez*, Executive Committee member, CC Communist Party of Ecuador, the country's main agricultural export items—cocoa, coffee, rice and bananas—have been an object of foreign monopoly plunder. These monopolies also control 50 per cent of the assets of industrial enterprises. In the previous decade, successive governments of a venal oligarchy signed over 30 contracts with US oil companies for geological prospecting on approximately 10 million hectares of land in the Gulf of Guayaquil area, on the coast and the continental shelf, or in areas potentially rich in oil. A government contract with the Texaco-Gulf consortium exempted the company from Ecuadoran control over oil exports, entitled it to fix oil prices, keep hard currency profits from oil, and so on.

It is becoming ever more evident, said *Jeronimo Carrera*, CC member, CP of Venezuela, that effective control by every nation over its natural resources and their utilisation is a requisite of full independence and national sovereignty. This is one of the key problems facing Latin American countries today.

In spite of the existence of huge natural resources, in particular oil, said *Julio Posada*, Central Executive Committee member, Communist Party of Colombia, our people are very poor. The cause of their suffering is primarily US imperialism, which has been exploiting Colombia for decades. Up to 1975, oil held second place in Colombian exports. But today the country is compelled to import oil to meet its own requirements because foreign companies restrict oil production in the country. It is estimated that by 1980 Colombia will be importing an annual 500 million dollars' worth of oil, that is, at a cost equal to one-third of its present hard currency revenue.

Puerto Rico, said *Carlos Rivera*, CC member, Puerto Rican Socialist Party, is a political, economic and military bastion of the United States in the Caribbean, a strategic base of imperialism on the continent. Ever since 1898,

when it was overrun by US troops, Puerto Rico has been under the direct political sway of the United States and our economy has been developing according to the needs of big multinational capital. In 1975 foreign, primarily US, investments exceeded $14,000 million. Puerto Rico's foreign debt in the same year was set at roughly $12,000 million and, moreover, the country must pay an annual $200 million in interest alone.

US imperialism, said *Cleto Souza,* Political Bureau member, CC People's Party of Panama, has been exploiting our country's principal asset—its geographical situation—ever since the turn of the century. I mean the Panama Canal Zone. Imperialism and monopoly capital, which own the Canal, derive huge profits from shipping and also use it for political and military interference in the affairs of Panama and other countries of the continent.

Having described the economic situation in their respective countries and throughout the continent, the participants in the symposium came to the conclusion that the chief cause of Latin America's backwardness and poverty is the policy of US imperialism, which plunders the region and prevents the independent economic development of Latin American countries.

Forms and Methods of Plunder

Appropriating the natural resources and raw materials of colonial, semi-colonial and dependent countries, A. Kohen said, is a feature of imperialism. With the colonial system falling apart, forms of appropriation are changing but the nature of imperialism today is the same as at the time of colonial wars. To be able to exploit these riches, imperialism resorts to war and intervention, to activity intended to undermine the political stability of countries that have won freedom or are fighting for it, as well as countries where the state sector of the economy has grown considerably or where reforms affecting imperialist interests are carried out. In Argentina, for example, imperialism prevented the implementation of even the reformist programme announced by the domestic bourgeoisie in May 1973, and now it is disgruntled by the fact that after the coup of March 24, 1976, Argentina's Pinochets have yet to gain the upper hand. The United States imposes on Argentina an open door policy towards foreign capital and the transfer of government enterprises to private owners on the propagandistic plea that the enterprises are "unprofitable".

Against the background of the energy crisis besetting the capitalist world, the economic programme now being carried out causes concern in official quarters, for it provides for the transfer to multinational companies of rich oil deposits on the mainland and the continental shelf, as well as minerals and other natural resources in the fertile humid pampas. This goes on hand in hand with increasing control by a handful of monopoly companies and big landed proprietors over meat and grain production and sales.

Now that the balance of forces is becoming increasingly unfavourable to reaction, the planned South Atlantic pact, to be based on the Brazil—South Africa—Argentina triangle, is designed to strengthen the strategic positions of imperialism and at the same time to maintain control over the vast natural resources and strategic raw materials (oil and other minerals, including uranium) to be found in the countries of the area, including the continental shelf and Antarctic territories.

To frustrate the efforts of the Popular Unity government, R. Rojas said,

imperialism resorted to an economic blockade, chiefly in the financial sphere. As for copper, steps were taken to prevent sales. By placing part of its strategic reserves on the world market with subversive intent while at the same time spreading lies about a "large stockpile" of the copper in our country, the United States caused damage to world copper trade as a whole. There was also the embargo on cargoes of our principal export item in foreign ports, imposed with an eye to causing a panic among Chile's partners on the copper market and making them distrustful of the solvency of our state.

US monopolies, said *Longino Becerra*, Political Commission member, CC of Honduras, have stepped up their plunder of Central American countries, using an integration machinery which has aggravated the structural crisis in our country, economically the most backward in the subregion. This circumstance has brought protection of our natural resources to the fore and we must fight for it to rid them of the hold of monopolies, the main sponsors of the plans for Central American economic integration now being carried out, and to put natural resources in the people's service.

Mention should be made of technological dependence as an important form of exercising imperialist control over our natural resources, said *Ivan Garcia Solis*, CC member, Mexican CP. Like most Latin American countries, Mexico is forced to pay imperialist companies huge sums for technological aid to its manufacturing industry. It paid them $840 million in 1968, $2,000 million in 1971 and as much as $2,600 million in 1974. The biggest profits are made in the chemical and medicinal industries because technological monopoly enables the big multinational companies arbitrarily to fix exorbitant prices for chemicals whose technological monopoly enables the big multinational companies arbitrarily to fix exorbitant prices for chemicals whose production costs are much lower.

The peoples of Latin America and the Caribbean, said J. Carrera, have had a long and bitter experience of unequal trade with European capitalist powers and the United States. Unequal trade is one of the principal causes of their poverty and as for the growing cost of living, it is a direct consequence of steadily rising prices for importing the monopoly-made goods.

To preserve its privileges in Ecuador, said E. Alvarez, Texaco-Gulf uses various devices. It boycotts oil export, thwarts the construction of a pipeline, fails continually to deliver petrol, gas, diesel and other fuels, launches campaigns against the Ecuadorian State Petroleum Corporation and against all attempts to pursue an oil policy independent of the monopolies.

Economic Measures Against Monopoly

In late years some Latin American countries have shown a mounting resolve to dispose of their resources on their own, according to their national interests. Already there are certain gains that have begun to deliver these countries from inequality and a subordinate role in economic relations between Latin America and the USA.

Speakers described nationalisation as one of the means helping to win economic independence. The nationalisation of Venezuela's oil industry on January 1, 1976, *J. Carrerra* pointed out, means undoubtedly—for all its shortcomings—that our country has taken a first important step towards assuming control of its basic resources. It has created the prerequisites for

pursuing an oil policy meeting the country's [illegible] interests, although the hope of setting up a national oil industry independent of imperialist monopolies is still far from coming true. We Venezuelans realise that the process of nationalising oil is still incomplete. You cannot nationalise so powerful an industry without meeting bitter resistance from foreign capital, which does its utmost to foil the successful activity of government enterprises in charge of this industry today. This is why, in addition to the nationalisation act, we must adopt economic and political measures at home and abroad to reliably safeguard Venezuela against inevitable attempts at retaliation and subversion by US oil companies. Besides, the policy of protecting non-renewable natural resources calls constantly for prompt action to put an end to their reckless exploitation.

The threat to the government's policy of protecting natural resources will grow daily and may result in surrender to imperialism, which would immediately set out to plunder the heavy petroleum deposits, still intact, in the famous Orinoco belt, where they are estimated at not less than 700,000 million barrels of crude oil and modern facilities would make it possible even now to produce much more oil than has been produced in Venezuela over the past 60 years. Venezuela must export both crude oil and petrochemicals. This is the policy proposed by the CPV Programme.

Such important measures as the nationalisation of the oil industry and iron ore mining, the consolidation of the state sector, plans to develop metallurgy and industry as a whole, and raising the standard of scientific and technological research could not have been adopted without a drastic revision of Venezuela's traditional international role. For the first time ever, Venezuelan foreign policy has come to diverge in some respects from the US State Department's.

While the Armed Forces Government of Ecuador has not nationalised the oil industry, said E. Alvarez, it has curbed monopoly privileges and is committed to a policy opening the road to struggle for the final recovery of the country's key asset. Appreciable headway has been made over the past four years if it is considered that oil production in Ecuador began only a short time ago. The gains made to date include the restitution of the greater part of the oil-bearing land concession, higher taxes on corporate profits, government prices for crude oil, the creation of the state-owned FLOPEC tanker fleet and the construction of a state oil refinery in the seaport of Esmeraldas.[2]

The transformation of Chile's economy under the Popular Unity, J. Benitez said, began with a policy of making the state sector dominant. An early measure carried out by the government was the nationalisation of copper, iron ore, nitre and other basic natural resources controlled by foreign and domestic monopolies. Economically, the nationalisation of copper meant transferring to the state what earlier had been pocketed in the form of profits by major US companies. These earnings were allocated for education, public health, housing and other purposes. In the 1965-1970 period, they added up (in the case of only the El Teniente, El Salvador and Chuquicamata mines) to almost $552 million. Politically, the nationalisation of copper was an important factor in uniting diverse social forces.

The experience of the popular government, R. Rojas noted, showed that by

setting a truly patriotic goal, you can mobilise the broadest social strata, foster their anti-imperialist consciousness and build up national unity. It also revealed that the people's sovereign will can impose such measures even on forces traditionally hostile to the country's interests, isolate them and defeat imperialism. The people's mobilisation to achieve this goal led to the nationalisation of copper, an act unanimously *approved even by parliament*, most of whose members were opposed to the popular government.

In assessing the social and economic process in Peru initiated with the assumption of power by the Revolutionary Armed Forces Government in October 1968, said *Moises Arroyo*, editorial staff member of *Unidad*, the Peruvian Communist newspaper, mention should be made, first of all, of the anti-imperialist agrarian reform, which is the most important of the changes being effected, as well as of the nationalisation of some industries and the infrastructure.

Ever since the 1910-1917 revolution, said I. Garcia Solis, Mexico has gone on fighting against multinational monopolies to recover its natural resources. Action by the peasants and workers in 1917 resulted in the adoption of Article 27 oof the Constitution formalising the nation's ownership of the land and mineral resources. The oil industry was nationalised in the thirties, under President Cardenas. However, owing to the country's subsequent development on state monopoly capitalist lines, nationalisation amounted to virtually strengthening the positions of the big bourgeoisie and financial oligarchy.

Commenting on the lines to be followed in developing an independent national economy, speakers stressed the need of close economic co-operation with the socialist community. It is well known that the construction of national industrial enterprises in a number of new Asian and African states with Soviet aid and the training of competent personnel for them enabled these countries to carry out extensive nationalisation and assume an independent role on the world market, until recently under undivided monopoly control.

The Soviet position on developing countries, said J. Carrera, was defined by the 25th CPSU Congress as follows: "The Soviet Union fully supports the legitimate aspirations of young states, their determination to free themselves completely from imperialist exploitation and dispose of their national riches as they see fit." Economic and technological co-operation between the socialist community and developing countries is intensifying. Due to it, as well as to expanding mutually beneficial trade free from the influence of multinational companies, the imperialists' absolute monopoly on trade and economic relations with the "third world" has been abolished. Ample opportunities have been provided to curb the activity of foreign capital and bring it under control, and the natural resources of nations have come to be utilised more effectively. Agreements signed by the Soviet Union with 56 developing countries envisage co-operation in the construction or extension of about 1,000 diverse projects. This co-operation is not burdened by any discriminatory stipulations injuring the sovereignty of developing countries. It is not prompted by selfish interests, such as a bid for concessions to work deposits or use cheap labour. The Soviet Union and other socialist countries are always willing to assist these countries in carrying out projects most likely to promote industrialisation, extend and consolidate the state sector—a most important factor for economic progress—and the requisite basis for an independent national economy.

Financial and technological problems, said J. Posada, can be solved with *the aid of the Soviet Union and other countries of the socialist community* on the principles of equality and mutual benefit. The socialist community is our principal ally on whom we can rely at every stage of our struggle for national liberation and socialism.

Due to the socialist community, said E. Alvarez, our peoples are in a position to carry on even more effectively their struggle against imperialist oppression, for the right to use their natural resources as they see fit, for sovereignty, national independence and social progress.

Speakers emphasised the role which the Soviet Union and other socialist countries play in the struggle of developing countries for a new economic order. In October 1976, A. Kohen said, the CC CPSU pointed out that the Soviet side takes "active steps . . . in support of the legitimate demands of the developing countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America for a reorganisation of international economic relations on the principles of equality and for the elimination of every form of exploitation of weaker 'third world' partners by capitalist countries. In this sphere as in many others, the interests of the socialist and developing countries converge."

Participants in the symposium voiced the opinion that to resist US economic aggression successfully, the governments of Latin American countries must support anti-imperialist integration processes on the continent, in particular by strengthening the Latin American Economic System. It should become, said R Gonzalez, a powerful force capable of neutralising the actions of big monopolies, calling a halt to imperialist plunder and serving as an instrument of winning genuine économic independence.

While noting the importance of the economic measures adopted by some governments to protect the nation's riches, speakers stressed that Latin American countries must launch a vast mass movement to establish effective control over their natural resources.

Growing Popular Movement

The peoples of Latin America have never stopped fighting against imperialist plunder of their natural resources. In Honduras, said L. Becerra, the struggle against imperialism finds increasingly widespread and strong expression precisely in the demand for the recovery of natural resources. Why? In every Latin American country, revolutionary forces are carrying on a political struggle against imperialism. This struggle requires a high degree of political consciousness and can succeed only if it encompasses primarily the workers, peasants and part of the middle strata. The purpose of the political struggle is to enable the masses to see for themselves that imperialism is their chief enemy. But the struggle against imperialism can be something more than a political struggle. It also expresses itself in the demand that natural resources seized by foreign monopolies be returned. The struggle for this demand can involve much larger sections of the population than political actions against imperialism do.

Protecting natural resources, A. Kohen stressed, helps to develop a broad democratic and anti-imperialist mass movement involving the workers, peasants and urban and rural middle strata, as well as part of the national bourgeoisie, the armed forces and the church, as well as governments opposed

to the predatory policies of imperialism. Current difficulties and imperialist counter-attack in a number of countries have not diminished the possibility of mass movements, of achieving unity of the anti-imperialist forces, including patriotic servicemen, and above all, of the working class and its Marxist-Leninist vanguard playing their role.

To bring about the national liberation of Brazil, said P. Baranna, it is indispensable to overthrow the Brazilian dictatorship, which now heads the bloc of fascist regimes in the southern part of the continent. This is also the only way to ensure that the country's immense natural resources are used for the good of its people, in particular through peaceful and friendly co-operation with fraternal countries. In championing the formation of an anti-fascist patriotic front, the Brazilian Communist Party proposes that diverse political forces work out a common action programme against imperialist monopoly plunder, in defence of oil, against contracts for oil prospecting and production.

The experience of Mexico's Communists, said I. Garcia Solis, shows that to protect natural resources, the anti-imperialist and democratic forces must, first and foremost, work out a programme for progressive economic changes providing for the protection of the national economy, curbs on monopoly profits, effective steps to reduce dependence on imperialism and a considerable extension of relations with the socialist and developing countries.

The Panamanian people know, C. Souza pointed out, that they must go through a stage at which the demand for the restitution of our natural resources now in imperialist hands, primarily the Canal Zone, is a slogan uniting all who want the national liberation revolution to win. Our people will spare no effort to expel the colonisers from Panama.

To end imperialist monopoly power in dependent countries, said R. Gonzalez, it is essential to set up a broad anti-imperialist front of all progressive and democratic forces, the section of the national bourgeoisie unassociated with foreign companies, privates, NCOs and officers (including high-ranking) dissatisfied with the regime.

Protecting natural resources, said A. Diaz Ruiz, is part of the struggle against imperialism. But only under socialism is it possible to bring them under full state control and use them for the good of the people. This, of course, does not imply that we underestimate the efforts made by progressive governments to protect national property. We have always backed these efforts and will continue backing them.

The Communists are in the forefront of the struggle of Latin American peoples for the right to dispose of their natural resources. Operating in difficult political conditions, especially in countries ruled by reactionary dictatorships, they work patiently and perseveringly, using flexible tactics, seeking and finding new forms of co-operation with non-Marxist revolutionary and democratic forces. All this helps the masses to realise that the Communists are loyal defenders of their interests and the staunchest fighters for national independence and social progress.

The Conference of Communist Parties of Latin America and the Caribbean, A. Kohen noted, signified the Communists' readiness to support every measure aimed at protecting natural resources and carry them through to their logical end. The Communists of Argentina have included in their programme a

chapter on "Recovery of National Riches and Independent Economic Development". This chapter provides for the expropriation and nationalisation of major foreign monopoly enterprises, in particular North American banks credit, financial and insurance companies owned by foreign capital, the domestic landed oligarchy or compradors, the transfer of all non-renewable natural resources, first of all oil, to the state, the protection of national industries, including private enterprises unless their operation runs counter to the national interest and is out of keeping with the country's economic development plan, and so on.

The Communist Party of Ecuador, said E. Alvarez, calls on all patriotic democratic and progressive forces, all servicemen and civilians, all believers and atheists, to campaign for the immediate nationalisation of the oil industry It welcomed and fully supported the Patriotic Front for the Nationalisation of the Oil Industry set up recently.

Colombia's Communists, said J. Posada, call for nationalisation of the oil deposits owned by US monopolies. This is a thoroughly patriotic slogan meeting the national interest, the interests of our people.

Our Party, said M. Arroyo, backed the expropriation of the US companies operating in Peru, as well as measures to reinforce the public sector and the government's anti-imperialist actions at home and abroad. Unfortunately, the process of anti-imperialist and anti-oligarchic changes has slowed down. The country is in a serious economic crisis. We Communists consider that the crisis cannot be ended through economic and political concessions to those who would like to nullify revolutionary gains and re-establish foreign control over our natural resources, that is, primarily by securing credits from international monetary organisations controlled by imperialism, increasing private investment and assisting capitalist enterprises to the detriment of the state and public sectors and at the cost of greater exploitation of the working people. We consider that it is indispensable to normalise the balance of trade and payments by encouraging internal accumulation, increase production for export, raise taxes on items exported by multinationals and plan industrial production. At the same time, our Party warns against the danger threatening the revolutionary process in Peru from home and foreign reactionaries, who are even agreeable to the prospect of a fascist dictatorship.

The struggle to protect natural resources, I. Garcia Solis stressed, ranges over a broad front. It encompasses diverse strata which together make up a mighty force capable of holding its own against imperialism. But only the working class and its political vanguard are equal to imparting a really consistent and militant character to the movement for the protection of our countries' natural resources, for national sovereignty.

The Guatemalan Party of Labour, said A. Bauer Pais, considers that to put natural resources under the nation's control, it is necessary to carry out an agrarian reform, confiscate and nationalise mineral deposits, transport, banking, the land and plant of enterprises owned by US and other foreign monopolies, annul the country's shackling foreign debt, establish trade relations with all countries on the basis of mutual benefit and introduce economic planning.

We Communists, said J. Carrera, are deeply interested in a growing mass movement for the protection of natural resources at both national and con-

tinental level. We believe this movement should give strong and militant support to every anti-monopoly initiative irrespective of what social strata took it. It would contribute to the formation of a broad national front needed for the victorious completion of the fight against imperialism, a fight whose objectives would include control over natural and other basic resources. The Venezuelan working class, without renouncing in the least its own policy and the fundamental principle of independence of its Party, appreciates the contribution which other classes and social strata make to the fight against imperialism.

Latin America's peoples are fighting for the right to dispose of their natural resources, speakers pointed out, in exceedingly difficult conditions. No quick or easy gains can be expected in this confrontation with imperialism and neocolonialism. But for all the difficulties, the movement for the protection of natural resources, inspired by the revolutionising experience of world socialism and above all by the example of socialist Cuba in the case of Latin America, is growing. It makes for the unification of progressive, patriotic forces, including some governments, in the struggle for national independence, deliverance from imperialist domination, for a better life for the peoples, against fascism, against home and foreign reaction.

The Outlook for a Comprehensive Solution

Participants in the symposium stressed that the problem of protecting natural resources can be solved radically and definitely only under socialism. There is no proceeding to socialist changes in the economy without state control over natural resources.

Before the victory of the revolution, said A. Diaz Ruiz, the situation in Cuba with regard to natural resources was the same as in most Latin American countries today. In other words, key resources were controlled by the US. The victory of the revolution on January 1, 1959, paved the way for genuine political and economic independence. The first important law in protection of natural resources was the agrarian reform law (1959), which did away with the latifundium system and granted the right to own land to almost 100,000 landless peasants. This meant winning for the revolution the political support of the poor and middle peasants, who are the chief ally of the working class in socialist construction.

However, the first agrarian reform law affected mainly US monopolies and the landed oligarchy. Property in land was limited to a maximum of 402 hectares. In reality this maximum turned out to be too great because it preserved a large stratum of rural bourgeoisie. Therefore, a new law passed in 1963 expropriated holdings in excess of 67 hectares.

The second law led to important changes in the pattern of agrarian property —70 per cent of the land became state property and the rest found itself in the hands of small and medium producers.

In addition to the agrarian reform laws there were other measures which ended imperialist domination over Cuba and made it possible fully to retrieve the nation's riches.

Speaking to the First Congress of our Party, Fidel Castro analysed Cuba's achievement in the economic field and the protection of its main natural resources. Nickel output had doubled as against 1958, electric power produc-

tion was up from 2,550 million to 6,500 million kWh, steel from 24,000 to 240,000 tons, fertiliser from 195,000 to one million tons. Cement output had increased from 743,000 to two million tons.

It was the revolution that enabled the country to reccover its natural resources and put them in the service of our people's legitimate interests. I wish to stress once again the significance of the aid we have had from the socialist countries, first of all the Soviet Union. Along with a vast amount of material means made available for oil production and mining, the afforestation, hydropower engineering, and economic development as a whole, hundreds of specialists from socialist countries co-operate with us in this important effort.[3]

A. Kohen, member of the *WMR* Editorial Board, summed up the discussion:

"Engels's words that were quoted here have a direct bearing on the problems we are discussing," he said. "They are the best evidence that the Communists' struggle for the protection of natural resources and for national independence has a long-standing tradition.

"The Conference of Communist Parties of Latin America and the Caribbean noted that socialism is our main goal but that it will only become a realistic programme for the countries of the continent in sustained struggles through radical changes, including the struggle to protect natural resources. To be sure, imperialism will never abandon its positions of its own free will, let alone the riches it has usurped. It resorts to political and ideological terror and tries to intimidate the peoples who own raw material resources with all sorts of misfortunes that would allegedly befall them if they resisted imperialist control and looked on highly industrialised capitalist countries, especially, the United States, as countries dependent on developing countries rich in natural resources. The authors of such theories conceal the circumstance that in the course of the formation and development of the capitalist mode of production in the United States, a rapid transition from free competition to monopoly and the formation of an imperialist economy, the US has found it more profitable to leave its own resources intact and exploit the cheap labour of colonial, semi-colonial and dependent countries. They also conceal the imperialists' immense responsibility for the reckless exploitation of vast natural resources, pollution of the environment, hunger, the food, energy and raw material crises, and so on. But the world situation is changing. The growing might of the socialist community and international detente afford the most favourable conditions for the protection of natural resources, make for recognition of every country's right to dispose of its resources, and spell an early end to plunder by imperialism and multinational monopolies.

"Lenin said that: imperialism means reaction all along the line. This political conclusion is suggested by economic relations shaped by financial capital and multinationals. In an effort to take possession of the national patrimony of our countries, imperialism sticks at nothing, as is shown by the tragic record of military intervention, the armed occupation of Puerto Rico, the Panama Canal Zone, the Malvive Islands and other territories, numerous coups in Latin America carried out with a view to establishing control over oil, copper, tin and other raw materials, the criminal terroristic and sub-

versive activities of the CIA. All this is indicative of the close connection between the struggle to protect natural resources and the struggle against imperialism and home reaction, for democracy.

"The theme of the symposium arouses tremendous interest among all genuinely patriotic sections of our peoples, who want to see their countries free, sovereign, independent, equal, and united for the common cause of peace, democracy and social progress."

The participants in the symposium summed up its results in a statement which reads in part:

"The various papers delivered at the symposium and the ensuing discussion showed by citing numerous proofs and precise data that US imperialism is the greatest usurper of the natural resources of our continent. It plunders and wastes these resources, threatening in many cases to use them up or destroy them and actually using them up or destroying them in some cases.

"Large-scale concentration of land in the hands of latifundium-holding companies, direct exploitation of oil deposits or a monopoly on the sale and production technology of oil, the working of other mineral deposits with a view to exporting them as raw materials, the indiscriminate felling of trees yielding valuable varieties of timber, control of water resources, control over shipping companies, and ownership of enterprises in the service industry are only some of the examples illustrating the situation in major extractive and manufacturing industries, which are an object of the most brazen plunder by imperialism and the military industrial complex on which it rests.

"Statements by participants showed that the new balance of world forces, which is ever more favourable to socialism, social progress and peace, affords propitious conditions for the steady development of the people's just struggle to recover their natural resources. Speakers pointed out the resolute support given by the Soviet Union and other socialist countries to the effort to attain these goals.

"The participants in the meeting stressed that at this stage unquestionable headway had been made towards recovering natural resources. This favourable situation has been developing above all since the victory of the Cuban revolution, which has regained all natural resources for the people.

"Faced with an irreversible process of history, the US imperialists resort to ultra-reactionary methods. They ally themselves with the most reactionary elements, to the point of imposing fascist regimes, as was the case in Chile, in order to prevent the people from using their natural resources properly and from exercising their independence and sovereignty. They have treated the Uruguayan people in the same manner, continuing the criminal practice initiated in Brazil in 1964. They have reduced Paraguay, Bolivia, Nicaragua, Guatemala and Haiti to a similar plight. . . .

"The participants in the symposium identified themselves with all Latin American fighters who are in prison because they champion their people's just cause. They also signified their full support for the struggle of the Panamanian people to re-establish their sovereignty over the Canal and their territory, for the struggle of Jamaica, Ecuador and Guyana to recover their natural resources, and for the Puerto Rican people's long and heroic struggle for independence from the US colonial yoke."

(*footnotes overleaf*)

[1] Frederick Engels, *Dialectics of Nature*. Moscow, 1972, p. 183.

[2] On January 1, 1977, the Ecuadorian government purchased all the shares of th Ecuadorian Gulf Oil Co., a member of the Texaco-Gulf consortium, and transferred t the Ecuadorian State Oil Corp. the plant owned by Ecuadorian Gulf Oil.—*Ed.*

[3] In January 1977, the CMEA Executive Committee discussed questions relating t Cuba's participation in specific long-range co-operation programmes, a greater contribu tion by CMEA countries to the development of Cuba's sugar industry, non-ferrou metallurgy, transport and paper industry, as well as problems of scientific and tech nological co-operation. The provision of new nickel-producing capacities in Cuba wil raise output to 130,000 tons a year.—*Ed.*

Towards a New International Economic and Political Order

GHEORGHE RADULESCU

Member of the Central Committee Political Executive,
Rumanian Communist Party,
Deputy Prime Minister of the Socialist Republic of Rumania

WE are living in an epoch of deep-going revolutionary, national and socia changes that are decisively influencing the world balance of forces and ar further strengthening socialism and the democratic and progressive movement

The Great October Socialist Revolution ushered in the era of mankind's revolutionary transition from capitalism to socialism. It has seen the establish ment and consolidation of the new social system, popular revolutions and the building of socialism in countries that account for a quarter of the world's territory and for a third of its population. In short, socialism became a worl system exerting a steadily growing influence on every aspect of internationa life.

Ours has been an epoch of the collapse of imperialism's colonial system: the nearly 100 new independent national states that have emerged represent ar immense world political force. Our epoch has seen the general crisis o capitalism, the further aggravation of its contradictions both on a national anc international scale. Before our eyes there is unfolding the revolutionary proces of economic and social renewal of the world, with more peoples striving tc refashion their lives along socialist lines.

Characteristic of our epoch is the tempestuous development of the produc tive forces and the broad sweep of the scientific and technological revolutior which opens up tremendous perspectives for progress in material production

It is against this background that one should see the vast scope of the struggle of the working class and the popular masses to transform nationa production relations and change the pattern of international relations. The peoples have come to appreciate the need for an end to the old system anc the old international relations, achieve mutual understanding and peacefu coexistence based on equality of all nations and countries and build a more just and better world on our planet. It is in this context that there matured, a a reflection of an objective historical necessity, the idea of fundamentall

structuring international economic and political relations and establishing a ew international economic and political order.

The UN General Assembly has in recent years adopted a number of very nportant documents on the subject. They provide an international framework ır active co-operation of all nations in finding constructive solutions for the omplex economic problems that face the present-day world and upon the olution of which depends mankind's progress and peaceful life.

The need for a new international economic order stems from the reality of ır times. The present long and profound crisis of the capitalist economy, hich is but a new stage in the general crisis of the world capitalist system, is centuating the instability of that system and, at the same time, is hampering e development of the world economy and of international economic relaons. For some time now there have been serious difficulties, caused by the ultinational monopolies, in the supply of raw materials, fuel and energy, and is is adversely affecting growth rates in many countries. The food crisis, ınger and malnutrition have spread to large areas of the world, threatening e very existence of some peoples and the progress of humanity.

There have been a number of negative developments also in the capitalist orld currency and credit system: galloping inflation which afflicts the onomy of the capitalist countries; instability of the main currencies used in ternational payments; balance of payments deficits in many countries. The ternational currency system devised some thirty years ago cannot cope with e world's grave economic problems. International markets are subject to arp, uncontrolled price fluctuations that are undermining the stability of ıtional economies and of world trade. All manner of restrictions and artificial ırriers, unjust discrimination measures, tariff and extra-tariff barriers, and e protectionism practised by some capitalist countries are disrupting intertional economic ties and obstructing free exchange and equal co-operation tween nations.

These negative developments are having an especially ruinous effect on the onomic and social position of many underdeveloped and developing untries. Their economic backwardness is a direct result of long colonial isrule and imperialist exploitation. The wide gap between developed and ıderdeveloped countries is becoming wider still.

This is evidenced by the following data: average per capita national income economically developed countries is 13.4 times higher than in developing untries and, according to some estimates, the gap will not be bridged even 1990. The ratio is much the same when measured in absolute figures: per pita national income in developed countries rose from $1,412 in 1950 to ,050 in 1973 and is expected to rise to $5,500 if the present trend continues.[1] 1973, 105 economically underdeveloped countries, with a population of 4 billion (64.3 per cent of the world total) accounted for only 11.1 per cent the world national income, whereas 34 economically developed countries, th a population of 620 million (16.5 per cent) accounted for 65 per cent.[2]

This wide and growing inequality is an impediment to the harmonious velopment of the world economy. It prevents balanced and just international change, fosters tensions and discord, is a constant source of political stability and presents a very real menace to world peace.

As a result, the developing countries, and especially the least developed, are burdened with a foreign debt which in 1973 amounted to $100 billion and, according to some estimates, had actually doubled by the end of 1976.

Servicing that debt and loan repayment are an unsupportable burden for these countries. Their balance of payments deficit increased from $12.2 billion in 1973 to more than $40 billion in 1975, and some estimates suggest that the figure will rise to all of $112 billion by 1980 if the present trend persists. Every year the developing countries import from 32 to 34 million tons of wheat, which meets only part of their food requirements, though hundreds of millions of hectares of good farm land are not being tilled. Or this comparison: the inflow of money into the developing countries in 1975 amounted to only about $20 billion, world expenditure on armaments amounts to about $300 billion a year.

It is a fact that this not only hampers efforts to eliminate economic backwardness, but also increases the menace to world peace.

All these negative developments and tendencies have had serious consequences for the people of various countries and for mankind as a whole. They reveal the harmful results of maintaining an international economic order imposed by the colonial powers and monopoly capital. The present system is clearly incompatible with the requirements of human progress, and yet the imperialists and neocolonialists are doing everything to keep it alive.

In discussing the main causes of these negative developments, Nicolae Ceausescu, General Secrtary of our Party and President of the Republic, noted that they stem from imperialist, colonial and neocolonial policy, from relations based on inequality, domination and oppression. "Retention of this policy and practice," he emphasised, "can only lead to serious upheavals in international economic life, to serious negative consequences for all the nations."[3]

Moved by concern over the present situation and by a sense of responsibility for the destinies of the peoples, the Communist and Workers' parties of Europe, at their Berlin Conference, called for "the elimination of colonialism and neocolonialism; the establishment of a new international economic order; the ensuring of conditions for the social and economic development of all countries, primarily the least developed countries; the organisation of broad international co-operation which should assist the peoples in the developing countries in their own efforts to remove the gap between these and the developed countries; the unrestricted exercise by each people of the right to sovereign control over its national resources; access by all countries to the achievements of modern science and technology; the establishment of a just relationship between prices for raw materials and agricultural products and prices for manufactured goods; and a broad development of trade relations without any artificial barriers and discriminatory practices".

These demands fully accord with the interests of all nations. For the instability of the capitalist world economy and the negative developments on the world market are bound to tell, in one or another form, on the situation in every country. This is so because there is a growing interdependence of national economies, and because of the closer international division of labour and broadening co-operation in industry, science and technology.

The ills of the present world economic system are most painfully felt by the developing countries. But realistic-minded leaders of the capitalist West admit

that the existing disproportions in the world economy are beginning to tell also on the long-range economic growth of industrially developed capitalist countries.

Some of the negative developments, for example, escalation of world prices, the deteriorating economic situation in developing countries, protectionist measures in the capitalist countries during the 1974-75 cyclical crisis, are making themselves felt also in the socialist countries. But drawing on the advantages of the socialist economic system, they have taken a number of measures to prevent or restrict the operation of these negative phenomena, and, most important, to prevent a slowing down of their dynamic social and economic development. Co-operation of their economies has played an important role in this.

In 1971-75 their average GNP growth rate was 8-9 per cent, or three or four times higher than in the capitalist countries. The socialist planned economy has thus demonstrated, and moreover in fairly complex conditions, its ability to ensure the stable and all-round development of society. This has further strengthened socialism and enhanced its prestige throughout the world.

However, in view of the peaceful, constructive character of socialist society, its humanistic aims, it should not be difficult to realise that the socialist countries are deeply interested in eliminating negative tendencies in the world economy, promoting a healthier economic climate, and fundamentally restructuring international economic relations. They believe that unhindered and broad international co-operation can become a major factor in building the new society. Attainment of these goals is facilitated by co-operation of the CMEA countries, both on a bilateral basis and within the framework of the Council, begun more than a quarter of a century ago. They are working towards a new type of international economic relations that would contribute to the all-round progress of each country, help the industrially underdeveloped countries, accelerate the process of levelling out economic development, and would make for closer understanding. Such, in fact, are the aims set out in the CMEA charter and Comprehensive Programme. At the same time, the socialist states are helping developing countries build up their industrial potential and train skilled personnel as part of their economic and social progress.

In the opinion of the Rumanian Communist Party, in promoting a new international economic order it is especially important to put an end to imperialist, colonial and neocolonial policy, to the present pattern of relations based on injustice, oppression and exploitation by other countries, and institute a new type of relations based on respect for independence and national sovereignty, full equality of all states, non-interference in internal affairs, mutual assistance, the inalienable right of each people freely to choose its social system and its path of economic and social development. This would entail also the right of every nation to be master of its natural resources and independently to decide on their disposal, and on the disposal of the results of the labour of its people in accordance with their interests and aspirations and with equal and just international co-operation.

Our Party and government believe that the rapid and continuous growth of productive forces and prosperity standards in each country and broad inter-

national co-operation necessitate the adoption and implementation of a complex of practical and effective measures designed to establish a new international economic order. This implies, in particular, the adoption of concrete standards binding on all states of the international community, and also a series of special programmes calculated to assure attainment of the goals set out above.

These measures were formulated by Nicolae Ceausescu in his report to the 11th Rumanian Communist Party Congress and were reflected in the Declaration which our Party presented to the 7th Special Session of the UN General Assembly. These measures call, first of all, for liquidation of economic backwardness, bridging the economic gap between developed and developing countries, measures to narrow development differentials and equalise economic levels of all countries, with due account, of course, to historical, geographical and climatic conditions in each country and the material requirements of its people in accordance with specific national conditions. To this end we should elaborate special programmes envisaging concrete measures relating to various aspects of the development of the productive forces: the building of a powerful national industry, the development of agriculture, transport and other branches of the economy.

Eliminating economic backwardness is doubtlessly a priority task of the developing countries, one that implies, first and foremost, overcoming the survivals of colonialism and neocolonialism, and refashioning social and economic structures to open the road to expansion of the productive forces. Our own experience has shown that a country which wants to overcome economic backwardness must devote a substantial part of its national income over a long period to economic development projects.

Some time ago, the United Nations sponsored in-depth research on this problem. The study compiled by a group of experts concludes that rapid progress in the developing countries is possible only if they appropriate from 30 to 35 per cent, and in some cases as much as 40 per cent, of GNP for economic upbuilding. And this requires, the authors of the study say, far-reaching social and administrative changes to secure fairer income distribution. Foreign investments are important but, they emphasise—and with good reason—less important than internal financial resources.

Since most of the wealthy, economically developed capitalist countries have assured their development by exploiting colonies and underdeveloped countries, it would be only fair and moral of them to return part of the appropriated riches to these countries and help them more substantially and in more ways to make economic and technological progress and build a new, up-to-date economy. Large-scale and effective aid to the developing countries in setting up their own industries and raising national production capacities, as well as these countries' active participation on an equal footing in the international division of labour are in keeping with the interests of all the peoples and states of the world, developed and developing alike, for they serve to guarantee steady, harmonious and balanced development of the world economy and hence benefit all countries.

But however considerable foreign aid may be, the social and economic progress of each country depends ultimately on its own effort. The RCP

Programme adopted by the 11th Party Congress (1974) says: "To regard the independent social and economic development of a country as the result of assistance from without means dooming the country to backwardness. The decisive factor for social and economic development is the effort of the people themselves. On this depends effective utilisation of both a country's own means and resources and the advantages of international co-operation, including support from other states."[4]

As for economic aid to the developing countries, mention should be made of the possibility of deducting for this purpose part of the huge sums now being spent on the arms race. Rumania has proposed to begin by cutting the military expenditures of all countries by at least 10 per cent, taking the 1975 amount as the basis, and put half of the money saved in this way at the disposal of a UN development fund that should be set up to aid economically lagging countries. It is primarily a question of countries whose per capita national income is below $200 (there were 47 such countries in 1973, with a total population exceeding half of mankind).

A reduction of military spending by all countries would enable the developing countries to gear their efforts and resources plus funds released as a result of this cut to more rapid economic and social progress. A continued arms race is generally incompatible with shaping new international relations based on mutual confidence, ensuring extensive international co-operation and establishing a new international economic and political order.

Another important condition for setting up a new economic order is to solve on a fair basis the problem of energy and raw materials with a view to supplying all countries with adequate quantities of both and meeting social and economic development needs. From this point of view, the research mentioned earlier has produced interesting findings.

Its authors hold that, speaking generally, the earth is rich enough in ores and fuels to meet world demand till the end of this century and, indeed, till the middle of the next. Utilisation of these resources can ensure an adequate rate of world economic development. But this necessitates intensive prospecting, especially in the developing countries, whose mineral resources have yet to be properly explored. This calls for large allocations. On the other hand, it is held that the costly yet increasingly imperative working of new lean ore and fuel deposits is bound to push up the prices of raw materials, minerals and fuels rather substantially before the end of this century. This means that to solve the problems of energy and raw materials, countries must co-operate extensively under a comprehensive programme aimed at utilising available resources, eliminating wasteful consumption, developing and using new sources of energy. Needless to say, every people must remain the master of their natural resources.

This requires, above all, a more equitable ratio between the prices of raw materials and industrial products, which must be correlated with the prices of agricultural products. After all, the so-called energy and raw material crisis is less due to a lack of resources or the feared likelihood of their running out very soon than to an unfair pricing system imposed by capitalist monopolies for decades. This system has injured the interests of underdeveloped and

developing countries and robbed them of means for rapid social and economic development.

Hence the need so to price basic commodities as to encourage the producer without being unfair to the consumer. And it must be borne in mind that the reduction of the real value of exports from developing countries is a consequence of the rapid growth of the prices of the manufactured goods, plant, food and services they import. This situation cannot be tolerated any longer. It is becoming more and more imperative to establish an international system guaranteeing stable prices for at least several years ahead.

In working for the establishment of a new international economic order, special attention should be given to solving the food problem. The food crisis is not due to the alleged exhaustion of food resources, the "lack" of spare farmland or the "overpopulation" said to be threatening mankind as a result of the "demographic explosion". The primary cause of the crisis is the backwardness of agriculture, especially in the developing countries.

Within the framework of the existing international capitalist division of labour, the monopolies have deliberately oriented agriculture in these countries on production of raw materials for export, particularly in unprocessed form, and not to supplying the population with food. This makes it indispensable to work out comprehensive programmes for the early development in these countries of agricultural production, specifically by cultivating unused lands, supplying more machinery and chemicals, building up-to-date irrigation systems, carrying out land reclamation, increasing crop yields, using new varieties of seed and raising new animal breeds.

The research I have mentioned, which has been done under the auspices of the UN, has revealed that by the year 2000 it will be technically feasible to increase the cultivated land area in the developing countries by roughly 230 million hectares. It is stressed that the technological revolution in the agriculture of the developing countries depends largely on effecting an agrarian reform and certain other social and administrative changes to overcome difficulties unrelated to technology.

This activity could be greatly promoted by establishing a fair ratio between the prices of agricultural products and raw materials and the prices of industrial products, as well as by encouraging agricultural exports from developing countries through prices and by other economic means.

Economic progress today requires unlimited access for all countries to the latest achievements of science and technology, and measures to support the underdeveloped countries' desire to create research and designing facilities and a technological potential of their own. All this could put an end to the dependence persisting in this field.

The training of national personnel, so essential for economic and social progress, is vastly important as a means of ending the developing countries' lag. The developed countries could back efforts in this direction by granting them scholarships and in other ways.

The chief prerequisite of a new international economic order is a rational and equitable international division of labour guaranteeing every nation an active and effective part in world economic co-operation on the principle of complete equality. This would mean, first of all, a proper world distribution

of the production of industrial, especially sophisticated, goods now concentrated in a few countries. If this problem were solved, the developing countries would have a bigger share in world trade in industrial goods, increase the volume, pattern and profitability of their exports.

It follows that a new international economic order means more trade and economic co-operation unfettered by restrictions of any kind, by any artificial barriers, discrimination or pressure, or attempts on the part of some countries to interfere in the affairs of others, all of which stem from the capitalist system. It also means efforts by all countries to set up a new, durable and equitable international monetary system that would reinforce national currencies, strengthen the rate of real, economically justified exchange and create the prerequisites of lasting monetary and financial relations. All this is also a key component of the whole range of international economic relations.

Evidently, to solve the problems I have listed and implement special programmes in various fields, appropriate organisational forms are required. Our country considers that the organisational framework for this is provided by the UN and its specialised agencies, which in the past three decades have gained a certain experience of promoting international co-operation and defining the principles, forms and methods of co-operation on a universal basis.

It is also possible to evolve within the framework of the UN specific standards for a new international economic order valid for all UN member nations. Provisions could also be made for the establishment of an agency open to all countries that would supervise adherence to these standards and the implementation of special programmes aimed at attaining the objectives of a new economic order.

Establishing a new international economic order is, in the opinion of the Rumanian Communist Party, part of a broader, genuinely revolutionary process of reshaping relations between states. It would be wrong to dissociate the economic and political aspects of new international relations by speaking of a new international economic order in "pure" form. There can be no establishing a new economic order without doing away with political inequalities and unfair practices, thoroughly democratising international relations and bringing all countries—big, small and medium—into the solution of complicated problems of world politics. Nor can detente, security and peace be achieved without establishing justice and equality in the world economy. The new economic order and new political order form a dialectical unity; they condition each other and are interconnected.

The task of setting up a new international order is inseparable, as our Party sees it, from the ideas of progress and socialism. The transition of the developing countries to socialism is a historical necessity, an objective requisite of rapid social and economic progress and of ending underdevelopment in a historically short time. "In the conditions of fast-developing modern productive forces and the contemporary scientific and technological revolution," the RCP Programme points out, "the capitalist road no longer enables these countries to make rapid progress. It is only socialism that can assure concentration of the means needed for the rapid development of the productive forces and the creation of an up-to-date technical and economic basis in the

hands of the whole people and unified, meaningful and particularly effective utilisation of these means. Only by reorganising industry and agriculture on socialist principles, according to one plan, with society directly guiding this activity, can the peoples put an end to their economic and social lag, build an independent economy and overtake the developed countries."[5]

More and more developing countries are renouncing the capitalist model. This tendency is manifest in investigations, reports and other works dealing with the current problems of the newly-free states, above all with the problem of closing the gap in economic development levels.

The struggle to abolish relations based on inequality and oppression, for a new international economic order and new international political relations, is a reflection of the world-wide conflict between oppressors and oppressed. "Reality shows," said RCP General Secretary Nicolae Ceausescu at the Berlin Conference of Communist and Workers' Parties of Europe, "that without rapid progress in the underdeveloped countries, without eliminating inequality and closing the gap in the development levels of different countries, ending the hunger and poverty affecting a large part of the world's population, and bringing about a new and just economic order, lasting peace on our planet is out of the question."[6]

On the other hand, the process of bringing about a new international economic order is taking place at a time when there are countries with opposed social systems. It will probably be long before this historical reality is eliminated. Therefore, in grappling with the formidable problems facing mankind, it is necessary to proceed from the principle of peaceful coexistence, the demand that all countries should co-operate actively to settle various issues in a new spirit of respect for the interests of all peoples, and the need to continue and strengthen the policy of detente and co-operation. This is the only way to a constructive solution of fundamental problems of key importance to the progress of world civilisation which require international effort.

Achieving security in Europe, extending co-operation between all European countries in various fields in complete accordance with the fundamental principles of international relations and the provisions of the Final Act of the Helsinki Conference, which must be unfailingly respected, are all likely to contribute substantially to the creation of a new international economic order and new political relations, and considerably to extend the possibilities of active co-operation between European and developing countries.

Like other developing countries, Rumania has inherited a certain economic lag. This is a result of protracted foreign domination, of exploitation by big imperialist monopolies, which before World War II controlled over 50 per cent of the Rumanian economy. The country's natural resources and the labour of its people brought the monopolies huge profits.

In the years of socialist construction, due to the advantages of the new system and to the people's hard work, our country has achieved signal successes in developing a socialist economy and has ended its economic lag. Nevertheless, its per capita national income is still only one-third or one-fourth of that of highly developed countries. This is why socialist Rumania is still a developing country. It is compelled to exert considerable efforts in order to close as early as possible the gap separating it from developed countries

and raise the people's material and cultural standards. Accordingly, it spends one-third of its national income on economic development.

A socialist as well as a developing country, Rumania is deeply interested in the triumph of a new international policy that would assure the progress of all countries, primarily of those lagging behind. Therefore it takes part in the activity of Group 77, which comprises over 110 developing countries. It also has a guest status at forums of the non-aligned movement, that important sector of the world anti-imperialist front.

This is why socialist Rumania, while concentrating its foreign policy efforts on the promotion of friendly relations and all-round co-operation with all socialist countries, also searches for the most suitable forms of co-operation with developing and non-aligned countries, both on a bilateral basis and on a world level. Trade between Rumania and these countries in 1975 increased more than five-fold over 1970. Prominent in mutual relations are co-operation in production, the utilisation of natural resources, the development of manufacturing and the modernisation of agriculture.

The Rumanian Communist Party considers that this activity is entirely in harmony with the overall policy of our country, serves the cause of solidarity and co-operation between socialist and developing countries and contributes to the unity of all anti-imperialist, progressive and democratic forces opposed to imperialist, colonial and neocolonial policies. In this way, our country contributes to the materialisation of the principles of peaceful coexistence and helps to further detente and international security, achieve the common goals of social and economic progress and ensure the well-being of peoples.

---

[1] *Era Socialista*, No. 7, 1976, p. 54.

[2] Ibid.

[3] Nicolae Ceausescu, *Romania pe Drumul construirii societatii socialiste multilateral dezvoltate*, Vol. II, Editura politica, Bucuresti, 1975, p. 702

[4] *Programul PCR de faurire a societatii multilateral dezvoltate si inaintare a Romaniei spre comunism*, Bucharest, 1975, pp. 180-1.

[5] *Programul PCR de faurire a societatii multilateral dezvoltate si inaintare a Romaniei spre comunism*, pp. 192-3.

[6] *Scinteia*, June 30, 1976.

Readers' Letters

The Trade Unions—What Should They be Like?

The questions raised in a letter from Greek trade union official Costas Maragulakis are answered here by Josef Hlavicka, a veteran of the Czechoslovak trade union movement, a leader of the pre-war Red Unions, and now a Presidium member of the Czechoslovak Central Council of Trade Unions and the Communist Party Central Committee.

Dear Comrades,

We in Greece are campaigning for a healthier trade union climate, for removal of all the reactionary leaders who took over the unions during the fascist regime. Using anti-democratic laws, the government is trying to prevent the organisation of unitary trade unions that would really uphold the workers' interests. What it wants is a docile trade union movement committed to class collaboration and "social partnership".

But the working class, the entire labouring population, want a united trade union movement founded on class principles, committed to securing a better life and countering monopoly and government attempts to shift on to the shoulders of the working people the burden of military expenditure and taxation, all the consequences of the sharpening crisis of capitalism.

Our workers draw inspiration from the socialist countries. And it is no mere accident that reactionary propaganda is at such pains to discredit them and hold up the system in Sweden, West Germany and certain other countries as models of "genuine socialism". Trade union activity in the socialist countries is deliberately presented in a distorted form.

I realise that comparisons are not always adequate. But I feel that closer acquaintance with the history of the fight for trade union unity, with the present role and significance of the trade unions in the socialist countries, would be of immense help both to Communist and non-Communist trade union activists. In particular I would like an answer to a question now being heatedly debated in Greece. Our opponents question the very principles of trade union unity on a class basis and of Party leadership as allegedly incompatible with trade union independence.

They argue that rejection by the trade unions of the socialist countries of the strike weapon as a way of resolving industrial disputes, their interest in developing production, strengthening labour discipline, raising productivity, make nonsense of the very idea of organising a union to defend the interests of the workers, that the trade unions are being converted into an "appendage of the Party and of the state", which, we are told, makes their policy "anti-labour".

Attributing to the trade unions in socialist countries the worst features of the compromising unions in capitalist countries is typical of enemy propaganda. We are asked to believe that there is absolutely no difference between the union structure in the socialist countries, where everyone, from manager to cleaner, belongs to one and the same union, and the reactionary "vertical trade unions". Broad union representation in government and public bodies in the socialist countries, we are told, is a mere formality, and that the system of "co-determination" in West Germany and other countries gives the workers much more factual rights than direct trade union participation in the management of industry and society in the socialist countries.

I have more questions, but I'm limiting myself to the most important ones, the answers to which would be of immense help to us.

With comradely greetings,

Costas Maragulakis

Athens

Dear Comrade Maragulakis,

You are right in remarking that it is not easy to compare the activity of the Greek trade unions with, say, that of the Revolutionary Trade Union Movement (RTM) of socialist Czechoslovakia. However, if such a comparison will help achieve the aims you mention in your letter, that is, help Communists and other trade union activists, then it will have served a useful purpose.

Let me begin by saying that the struggle to give the trade unions a definite orientation—class, *revolutionary or compromising*—is being waged, in one form or another, in all the capitalist countries. This is evidence of the growing role of the trade unions as the biggest mass organisations of the working people and of their increasing influence on socio-economic and political processes in every country. The image of every trade union is determined by its political orientation, by whether, as an organisation of the working people, it stands up for the interests of the masses, or whether it holds aloof from the class struggle, becomes a "company union", and therefore forfeits the right to call itself a workers' organisation.

Under the first republic (1918-1939), when the bourgeoisie was in power, we in Czechoslovakia had to decide: should the trade unions remain narrow craft organisations or should they form a united organisation representing the majority of the working people? The urban and rural proletariat, artisans, even small businessmen, all those who in pre-Munich Czechoslovakia were exploited by the bourgeoisie, came to realise that their numbers and their strength could be effectively brought to bear only if they acted in unity and solidarity against capitalism as a social system.

The Communist Party of Czechoslovakia, which led the political and social battles of the working class, campaigned for genuine revolutionary unions that would uphold the interests of the entire working class, of all working people. Such an organisation was founded in the 1920s, "Rudé odbory"—Red Trade Unions—their main aim being the establishment of a just social system. The struggle for that aim was combined with defence of the workers' day-to-day interests. The Red Unions was a fundamentally new type of trade unions in Czechoslovakia; it had nothing in common with the reformist, and in some cases, reactionary, labour organisations.

The bourgeoisie tried to ignore the Red Trade Unions. Nor were they accepted by part of the workers misled by capitalist propaganda, which adroitly used such false slogans as "class truce", "solidarity of all Czechs and Slovaks", etc. We had our Masaryk, Svehla, Bata—the men in power in capitalist countries today have other names, but their propaganda weapon has undergone little change. We learned from our experience that organisational disunity, the absence of a united trade union movement, plays into the hands of our class enemies; that the only way to fight capitalism is by winning over the workers to revolutionary ideas and establishing ideologically mature trade unions comitted to the class aims of the proletariat.

The Red Trade Unions prepare the ground for the emergence, after the defeat of fascism and Czechoslovakia's liberation by the Soviet Army, of the united Revolutionary Trade Union Movement, founded on consistently class, internationalist and socialist principles. It continued the traditions of its predecessor, but its political aims were, of course, different: working-class

power through proletarian dictatorship and ... in charting ... country's socialist development.

That was accomplished in February 1948, when our working class, led the Communist Party, finally took over power and addressed itself to refashioning of society along socialist lines. The trade unions made inestimable contribution to the February victory, which did not come easily

Many trade unionists in capitalist countries ask me about our experience those crucial years. We are prepared to share that experience though, course, we no not offer any universal solutions. The socialist revolution mu always reckon with the alignment of class forces in the concrete conditions a given country which, as a rule, are not duplicated in other countries. Still, believe that some general conclusions can be drawn from what happened Czechoslovakia. The most important is the need to win the support of t working class, led by its revolutionary party. Under Party leadership the RT became a key factor in uniting the working class and all the exploited to fig capital, win and safeguard their economic, social and cultural rights.

Before and during the socialist revolution all our efforts were concentrat on this and, I think, that trade unions in other countries will have to through the same process. For though the West-European Social-Democr leaders are loud in proclaiming that theirs are "socialist" countries, the fa remains that in none of these countries has the exploiter system been abolishe and the building of socialism begun. That is part of the answer to you question: is Party leadership compatible with trade union independence in th struggle against capitalist power? In our judgment, it is not only compatible but necessary, for Party leadership gives union activity a revolutionary and nc "class-conciliatory" orientation in the fight against exploitation and fo genuine emancipation, which can only come with socialism. And Party leader ship is equally necessary under socialism, but I will deal with that aspect later

In a socialist society the working class is the ruling class and there is n exploitation. It is only natural, therefore, that the unions, that mass organisa tion of the working people, should play a new role. It would be wrong to think that their role diminishes because the chief enemy, capitalism, has beei vanquished and the unions have no one to fight. No, there are plenty o "enemies", and they try to spoil the life of the people and prevent the buildin of socialism and communism. There are all manner of shortcomings anc impediments to efficient organisation, a bureaucratic approach to people anc their work, and various other obstacles. The trade unions cannot be impassive to this. For we are fighting for the aims of our class, for its cause, for the success of socialist construction. And since the trade unions are a voluntary organisation, with education one of their main functions, it is their duty tc cultivate in the workers a socialist attitude to one's job, teach them to run the country and society. That is part of their new, broader and more importan constructive function under socialism than their purely defensive function ir capitalist society.

The resolutions of the Eighth World Trade Union Congress[1] are probably not widely known in Greece. Incidentally, they were drafted chiefly by trade unionists from capitalist countries. Acquaintance with the work of unions in the socialist countries led them to conclude that the trade unions of the socialist

countries now have rights, opportunities, freedoms and responsibilities, unknown in capitalist countries.

That is borne out by our own experience. The Constitution of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic guarantees not only the right to trade union organisation, but, together with other laws, provides for conditions enabling the workers to share in the management of industry and in the administration of the state through their trade unions. And our unions are not an "appendage of the state", but a cardinal element of genuine democracy—such is the role of the trade unions under socialism. We understand democracy to mean much more than supporting one or another candidate or party at election time. For us democracy means comprehensive worker participation at all levels of government and in formulating and implementing government decisions. Our laws give the RTM, and through it the working people, supervisory powers, including the right to recall administrative and economic officials who are not doing a proper job and whose activity runs counter to the interests of the working class.

Relations between our unions and the state are based on mutual support and co-operation, for both have identical interests and aims. The Revolutionary Trade Union Movement is helping all workers realise that in working for society, for their socialist state, they are working for themselves, and that the destinies of the country are in their hands.

We make no secret of the fact that our society is led by the Communist Party. On the contrary, we consider this a tremendous boon for the working people and, consequently, for their trade unions. And we proudly say (as we have every right to) that the trade unions are close helpers of the Communist Party. For the Party's policy is directed at the all-round development of society and is the consummate expression of the interests of the working people. The results of that policy can be seen in the peaceful life of our people, who do not have to fear crises and unemployment, and whose far-reaching social gains could be won only in a socialist society. That is why we consider it our revolutionary duty to persuade every worker actively to support Communist Party policy. We measure the genuine revolutionary character of the trade unions by their participation in the revolutionary transformation of society, in creating new values, improving economic management, educating our people to see in their work for the commonweal the supreme aim of their life and their happiness.

You say that these principles are exploited by bourgeois propaganda to accuse our unions of having become an "apendage" of the Party. All our experience points in another direction. And that experience has shown that when these principles were not observed, when the right-wingers were able, for a certain time, to impose on the unions so-called "independence" of our Communist Party, this jeopardised the gains of the working people. That is precisely what happened in 1968-69, when there was economic dislocation, inflation, the preparation of measures that were inimical to the interests of the people, etc. And all this only because the right-wingers were able, for a certain time, to paralyse the leading role of the Party.

This does not mean that the Czechoslovak trade unions do not defend the working people's just interests. On the contrary, the decisions of the Com-

munist Party, the laws of our socialist state, the decisions of leading trac union bodies, add up to a comprehensive system, unknown in any capitali country, which effectively guarantees the interests and future of our citizen As a rule, the trade unions initiate labour and social legislation, are in fu charge of the sick-benefit scheme, recreation and health-resort facilities th serve the working people. I say "working people" and not "union members because our laws make no distinction between union members and no members; we look after the rights of everyone, we represent everyone involv in the production of material values.

As you remark in your letter, our trade union branches include everyon from manager to cleaning woman. Naturally, their interests often differ, bu there is none of the *antagonism* so typical of every capitalist factory. That i the fundamental difference between our socialist trade unions and th "vertical" unions in the capitalist countries. Their purpose is to submit labou to capital by uniting in one and the same organisation the worker, the capitalis manager, even the capitalist himself. I might add that we always take int account the different requirements of trade union members. We devote th same attention to providing better conditions for the cleaning woman and fo the factory manager, who, incidentally, cannot make any decisions withou consulting the union.

Strike action, that typical trade-union weapon in capitalist countries, is a stage long passed in our country where there are no antagonistic contradic tions. Our unions have ample opportunities to share in the formulation of al measures bearing on the future of society and effectively to promote th workers' interests. In the process of socialist construction we have develope a mechanism for democratic solution of all disputed questions and fo balancing the interests of the individual, the collective and the society, both o a day-to-day and longer-term basis. The socialist state does not try to solve it economic problems at the expense of the working people by "freezing" wages reducing expenditure on public health, education and housing or by raisin prices. On the contrary, if anything is "frozen" in a socialist country it is price on basic foods and other consumer goods. And this is accompanied by a steady growth of real wages and higher living standards. The trade unions and the state have one and the same aim, namely, to produce more so as to giv the people more of the good things of life. Hence, strikes as a means o resolving management-labour disputes are no longer in the interest of societ or of the trade unions.

Under socialism, the results of society's labour effort belong to all it members. Discussing the aims of the RTM, one of its most prominent leaders Antonin Zapotocky, said that they could be formulated in this slogan: "Ever worker must become the master of his factory."[2]

That slogan is being put into practice. The trade unions have an active par in drawing up production programmes, also in discussing all changes during the production cycle. The law makes it incumbent on all middle-ranking government and economic officials to discuss their economic plans with the appropriate trade union organisation and see to it that the conditions required for plan fulfilment are included in the collective agreement. This procedure has fully justified itself. We discuss plan assignments at factory meetings and

production conferences not only in order to solicit amendments and suggestions, but also to bring home to the workers the understanding that the plan requires concerted effort, and thought on how best to carry it out.

Agreement on fundamental questions between management and workers does not mean agreement on all details. That would be unrealistic, for the production rhythm might be distributed by poor organisation, late deliveries of materials, etc. And this would be bound to tell on efficiency. There are also cases of another kind: a worker may be doing a poor job, producing lots of rejects. All such matters are discussed at meetings and production conferences, and there is not always complete unanimity. Solutions are found through timely and concrete criticism, through thorough discussion of the causes of the shortcomings and the ways to correct them.

I have already mentioned how the trade unions influence labour legislation, and that no important government decision can be made without their knowledge and consent. The unions not only have a part in framing such legislation, but also in seeing that it is stringently observed. That trade union representatives in legislative bodies are making effective use of their right to initiate new laws can be seen from our Labour Code and other more recent legislative acts adopted on trade union initiative.

Everyone who has been to Czechoslovakia and has visited our factories and trade union organisations could see for himself that no law or government measure pertaining to wages, working conditions, industrial safety and hygiene, rest and recreation facilities, can be adopted without trade union consent. What we have, therefore, is factual worker participation in management, and not simply nominal, formal rights. Every factory trade-union committee has special commissions to deal with grievances, safety arrangements, cultural facilities, housing, social insurance, etc. And these commissions have wide powers, including the right to suspend operation of any decision by management, veto the introduction of unfair work norms, etc.

Clearly, these are much wider rights than the "co-determination" system won by the trade unions in some capitalist countries after hard-fought struggle. It can produce only partial, though necessary, improvements in wages and working conditions. Under socialism the working class has no "partner" with which to engage in "co-determination". For the workers are the owners of all the means of production and through their elected representatives at various levels of power—but working-class, proletarian power—they decide on how to distribute all the values they produce.

Our enemies can go on calling this an "anti-labour" policy, but we in our trade union movement are firmly convinced that we have no greater role to play than furthering and bringing to reality the humanistic principles of socialist society.

With comradely greetings,

Josef Hlavicka

Prague

---

[1] Held in Varna, Bulgaria, in 1973, when the colonels then in power in Greece prevented information about the progressive workers' and trade union movement reaching the country.

[2] *Komunismus Nas cil*. Prace/Praha, 1971, p. 135.

Marxism-Leninism: The Source of Strength

William Kashtan, General Secretary, Communist Party of Canada. *Towards Socialism*. Selected Writings 1966-1976, Progress Books, Toronto, 1976, 372 pp.

Alfred Dewhurst, member of the CPC Central Executive Committee, writes n the Foreword to this collection of writings and speeches by William Kashtan: "In these selected works, the author explains the position of the Communist Party on the vital questions facing Canada and Canadians. He exposes the political and ideological roadblocks that retard forward social development both on the home and on the front of international working class and democratic struggle. . . . These questions and the immediate and long-term answers of the Communist Party are dealt with in the pages of this book in live and creative Marxism-Leninism" (pp. X, XI).

All this is equally true also of the speeches by William Kashtan addressed to the Party and his written words addressed to the Canadian readers, Communist and non-Communist, in which he gives a Marxist-Leninist analysis of the vital problems of the class struggle carried on in Canada and in other parts of the world and, not least, the struggle for a strong, united Party.

About a decade ago the *Toronto Star*, the paper of the Canadian bourgeoisie, wrote that "the Reds (in Canada) had failed" and that the source of that failure was that the CPC "continued to talk of Marxism-Leninism". Kashtan's reply was trenchant. Speaking at the 19th Congress of the CPC he said that the Party of Canadian Communists saw Marxism-Leninism as a "source of strength". "It is a science," he continued, which "gives us an ability to relate the present to the future, to see and understand the real processes and contradictions at work in capitalist society and to make our contribution to the advance of the working class and democratic movements in their struggle against monopoly rule and eventually for the socialist transformation of society" (p. 26).

Throughout the book the recurring themes become more insistent and demands more strongly pronounced in the interests of the Canadian working class and its allies. Decisive anti-monopoly drive for the interests of the broad popular masses and the persistent effort to build up proletarian international links with the world Communist and Workers' parties constitute, as the book shows, a solid feature of the policies and actions of the CPC and its leaders.

The keynote addresses call for an independent Canadian foreign policy for stepping up the struggle against US control, for Canada's full independence, for a new, made in Canada Constitution based on equal, voluntary partnership of the two nations (English and French) and on the right to self-determination up to, and including, secession,[1] for a guarantee of full democratic rights to all nationalities, against nationalism and racism. The struggle to extend democracy, the author stresses, must include defence of the rights

of the Indian, Innuit (a northern nationality) and Metis peoples, full recognition of their national identity and the development of their native cultures. This struggle also implies support to the demand for regional self-government of the Indian and Innuit peoples.

Coming out relentlessly for social progress and co-operation of the left forces, Canadian Communists carry on work for stronger unity within their own Party. This all-important matter of unity was dealt with in some detail at the 20th Convention of the Party in 1969. Before the convention, the questions discussed on the highest ideological plane raised points of difference between Communists. William Kashtan, speaking at the Convention on behalf of the Central Committee, argued that the CPC was "not only a party of action but also a party of unity of will, that is, a party with a common ideological standpoint, one political and tactical line". "To lose sight of this fact," he went on, "would undermine the unity of the Party. To have comrades go their own way, accept the questions of actions they may agree with, is to undermine the revolutionary character of our Party" (p. 79). "When the Party does not fight opportunism, opportunism takes over," the Convention stressed (p. 80).

The special importance of the 21st Convention of the CPC lay in the fact that it was held in 1971, the year of the Party's Golden Jubilee and that it had the task of adopting the Party Programme and a policy statement setting forth the immediate tasks of the Communists. The Programme, Kashtan writes, "situates the distinct stage of the anti-monopoly coalition and government based on it while emphasising its relationship with the struggle for socialism" (p. 167).

William Kashtan's book explains and specifies the challenging plan of struggles for a democratic way out of the deepening crisis, including monetary crisis, which tend to further affect Canadian independence, and ways of improving the economic situation. It includes the following provisions:

—adoption of a long-term and balanced all-Canadian industrial development programme, ensuring a rational utilisation of Canada's resources under public ownership. This is to be followed by regional development programmes merged with the overall programme;

—restructuring of Canada's trade policies to make possible the extension of trade with socialist and newly-free countries on a mutually advantageous basis;

—an active policy of peaceful coexistence, withdrawal of US military bases from Canada and an end to flights by US military aircraft over Canadian territory;

—economic and social policies directed to achieve full employment, rising living standards, and a say for every Canadian on all questions affecting the lives of the people;

—adoption of a new Constitution based on equal voluntary partnership of the French-Canadian and English-speaking peoples and on their right to self-determination;

—adoption of a Bill of Rights which guarantees the right of labour with respect to collective bargaining, the right to strike, to picket, to organise. No wage freeze or incomes policy (pp. 186-187).

The task is, Kashtan stressed at the 22nd Convention in 1974, to mobilise the broadest popular masses in Canada to join the implemention of the Communist programme for democratic reform and to draw all anti-monopoly forces in this struggle (p. 258).

The book ends with the article "Canada in a Changing World", a summary of a decade of working-class and democratic struggle, written especially for the collection, in which the author notes that the struggle is gaining the momentum parallel with the steady economic growth of the world's first socialist state, the USSR, and the entire socialist community. Against this background the contradictions in crisis-ridden Canada appear glaringly conspicuous. The data on the growing unemployment in Canada, which seems to be an incurable ailment of the capitalist world, sound as the author's stern indictment of capitalist reality: in 1967 there were 315,000 unemployed in Canada; in 1974, 520,000; and in 1975, close to 800,000 (in the beginning of 1977, unemployment figures for Canada, as estimated by the trade unions, bordered on the 1,185,000 mark—*B. S.*).

"Truly it can be said that Canada is at the crossroads," Kashtan writes in conclusion. "The working class and working people are not only faced with the necessity of uniting their ranks to defeat the monopoly offensive; the Canadian people are also faced with the necessity of checking and defeating the growing pressures of US imperialism on Canada, and winning the new direction in Canadian policy. That is the crucial task" (p. 315).

The articles and speeches included in Kashtan's new book show that Canadian Communists, who have joined in the effort to carry out the programme of action charted by their 23rd Convention (October 1976), well aware that they are part of the international revolutionary movement, come out for unity of the three components of the movement: the world socialist system, the international working class and the national liberation movement. The book brings to the forefront the courage with which problems facing their countries are tackled by Communists, in this case, the Communists of Canada. It shows the firm confidence of Canadian Communists, based on a Marxist-Leninist analysis of present-day realities, that the working class, of which they are the vanguard, will fulfil its historic mission and lead the country towards peace, progress, independence and socialism.

Betty Sinclair

---

[1] To this end, in 1965, the Communist Party of Quebec was established as a distinct entity. This action was an integral part of the struggle of the CPC for a voluntary, equal partnership of English and French Canada and the adoption of a new Canadian Constitution.

Revolutionary Brotherhood

Participation of Yugoslav Working People in the October Revolution and Civil War in the USSR. Documents and materials. Moscow, Nauka, 1976, 556 pp.

In all respects this carefully researched work is the first volume of documents recreating a broad picture of the many-sided political and military activities of Yugoslav internationalists in revolutionary Russia in the period from April 1917 to April 1921 and the active part they played in the struggle for the victory of Soviet power. The volume, identical editions of which have been put out in Moscow and Belgrade to mark the 60th anniversary of the October Revolution, is a joint venture by Soviet and Yugoslav historians and researchers, working in central and local archives in the USSR and Yugoslavia. They painstakingly studied a wealth of material, particularly newspapers and journals published in those revolutionary years by the internationalists and circulated among Yugoslavs and members of other nationalities who found themselves in Russia during the First World War.

Most of the documents are here made public for the first time. Those not included figure in the commentaries. The book also contains materials from periodicals, many of which are out of print.

Historians will be interested in the material on the Yugoslav Communist group in the Russian Communist Party and its local branches. The documents from the archives of the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia reflect the attitude in those days of the working people on the territory of what is now Yugoslavia towards the October Revolution. They also reflect the mounting revolutionary movement there, influenced by the events in Russia, and the vain attempts by the authorities to destroy the "Bolshevist contagion". More information is provided on the outstanding Yugoslav internationalists Oleko Dundic, D. Serdic and B. Agatonovic who made a big contribution to the Red Army's victories over the White Guards and interventionists. There are many new names and facts, attesting to the revolutionary selflessness and dedicated internationalism of the Yugoslav working people, who fought for the revolution shoulder to shoulder with their Russian brothers and members of other nationalities.

All in all, this is a rich source of information for those studying the history of the Great October Socialist Revolution and its international implications.

Although this is a work mainly for historians, it should likewise be of interest to the younger generation in both countries, to our contemporaries who cherish the ideals of peace and freedom, giving them a new insight into the events of the revolution. Much can be gleaned by the historian from the military orders, resolutions of meetings and conferences, newspaper accounts and magazine articles, etc.

For the young Yugoslavs and other internationalists, the months and years spent in Russia, their part in the struggle for the victory of the revolution, were an invaluable school of class struggle and proletarian internationalism.

Many went on to become prominent in the international Communist movement, leaders of Communist parties. Many of the Yugoslav internationalists, inspired by Lenin's ideas and the achievements of the October Socialist Revolution, helped establish the Hungarian Soviet Republic in 1919, saw action with the anti-fascists in Republican Spain, fought together with the Soviet people in the Great Patriotic War, and in the liberation movement and socialist revolution in Yugoslavia.

"The Great October," wrote Josip Broz Tito, Chairman of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia and a former soldier in the Red Guard, "ignited the revolutionary spirit in the hearts of millions of working people the world over, inspiring them with confidence in their great struggle for a new world. . . .

"That is why the October Revolution, this majestic turn in the life of man, has been and remains a solid foundation of the modern history of civilisation. That is why the gains of October, this great cause of Russian workers and peasants, have been acclaimed by working people the world over."

The experience of history and the revolutionary practice of our days prove irrefutably that no one has ever been able to extinguish the flame of the international solidarity of Communists. This flame that flared so brightly during the days of October has been borne by generation after generation of revolutionaries. Proletarian internationalism is the indestructible weapon of the international working class, and this book, a collective effort by Soviet and Yugoslav researchers, is proof of that.

V. Dino

A Staunch Internationalist

Rodolfo Ghioldi, *Escritos* (Writings), Vol. III, Buenos Aires, Editorial Anteo, 1976, 270 pp.

Volume III of the writings of Rodolfo Ghioldi, Executive Committee member, CC CP of Argentina, has come out in Buenos Aires. The *WMR* has already reported on Ghioldi's philosophical and sociological writings, which made up the bulk of Volume I and whose publication was a notable event in Argentine public life. It also reported the appearance of Vol. II, which comprises fundamental works analysing the situation in Argentina and theoretical problems of key importance, such as the Communists' attitude to the state, democracy and the agrarian question.[1]

Vol. III came out shortly before the 80th birthday of the author, whose life is inseparable from the international Communist movement and the Communist Party of Argentina. Ghioldi was one of the founders of the CPA along with Victorio Codovilla and has been a member of its Central Committee ever since.

"The glorious Communist Party of Argentina, founded in the wake of the Great October Socialist Revolution and now entering the 60th year of its existence," says the congratulatory letter sent to the Communist leader on the

occasion of his birthday by the CC CPSU, "has been together with the CPSU throughout these decades in the struggle against fascism and imperialism, for peace, democracy and socialism. It has fought unrelentingly against every attempt to distort the great doctrine of Marxism-Leninism. Your contribution to this noble and selfless struggle is widely known, Comrade Ghioldi. You who met the great Lenin and devoted your whole life to Lenin's cause have won deep esteem among all genuine Marxists-Leninists."[2]

A tried and tested leader of the international Communist movement Rodolfo Ghioldi is warmly congratulated in other messages. He was decorated with the order of the October Revolution in 1972 and now, on the occasion of his 80th birthday, the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR has awarded him the order of Friendship Among the Peoples. The Soviet Academy of Sciences Institute of the International Working-Class Movement has conferred on him the degree of doctor honoris causa. These are all indications of the widespread recognition of the revolutionary services of this Communist, man of learning and staunch Leninist internationalist.

Vol. III is further evidence of the consistency and firmness of Ghioldi's convictions and his loyalty to internationalist principles. He stresses time and again that for a Communist, patriotism and internationalism are inherently interconnected, and that genuine patriotism has nothing to do with nationalism or chauvinism. "Every revolutionary movement," the author writes in one of his articles, "has its own national characteristics due to purely national features. As for nationalism, it develops only when these features are exaggerated, put first and absolutised, all of which harms the cause of proletarian internationalism by undermining its principles" (p. 201).

There are some excellent articles in this volume on Lenin and Leninism, the Soviet Union—the world's first socialist country—and problems of today. They are written with the force of conviction that is so typical of this author.

Ghioldi's recollections of Lenin and the Third Congress of the Comintern are especially notable. He went to the Congress (Moscow 1921) as a CPA delegate and was subsequently elected to the Executive Committee of the Comintern. The central topic of his recollections is Lenin's speech to the Congress—the deep impression made on the audience by Lenin's forceful arguments and brilliant mastery of the art of polemics, and also the unassuming manner and personal magnetism of the leader of the world proletariat.

The book, which deals with the revolutionary transformating role of Leninism in Latin American conditions, specifically in Argentina, comes at an opportune moment, at a time when the peoples of the world are preparing to celebrate the 60th anniversary of the Great October Revolution. It is all the more important because the ideologists of imperialism and their yes-men are carrying on a campaign designed to mislead people about what Marxism-Leninism stands for.

The military coup in Argentina (March 24, 1976), resulted in the suspension of legal activity by all political parties, including the CPA, of course. But Ghioldi and other Communists have kept up the search for a solution of the country's crisis, a solution at grips with reality and promoting the unity of all popular and patriotic forces, both civilian and military. His writings are invariably marked by consistent efforts to establish with the utmost accuracy

the nature of changes needed to bring about genuine democracy in Argentina and remove the obstacles raised by foreign monopolies and the landed oligarchy. "The assimilation of Marxism-Leninism," Rodolfo Ghioldi stresses, "is a prerequisite of victory for the democratic, agrarian and anti-imperialist revolution and its subsequent advance to the socialist stage" (p. 92).

A. K.

---

[1] See *WMR*, July and November 1976.
[2] *Pravda*, January 21, 1977.

Present-day Capitalism and Classes

John Westergaard and Henrietta Resler. *Class in a Capitalist Society. A Study of Contemporary Britain*, London, Heinemann, 1975, XV, 432 pp.

The publication of this study is significant for many reasons. First, because this book, whose authors speak of the "Marxist perspective" in their approach to crucial social problems, has been put out by a leading bourgeois publishing house, This is, in a way, a sign of the growing respect for and popularity of Marxist ideas. Second, for some time now, bourgeois and right-reformist politicians and scholars and the capitalist media have been at pains to prove that the welfare state has eliminated the basic elements of "class inequality". This is coupled with propaganda of such ideas as the "end of classes" and of "overcoming capitalism". Marxists-Leninists and all objective researchers have consistently opposed such concepts. The central theme of this book is that the many forms of inequality in Britain today constitute class inequality rooted in the very nature of capitalism and determined by possession or non-possession of private property. More, this viewpoint is accepted as self-evident and the authors have been all but accused of trying to force an open door.[1] This is likewise unquestionable proof that opposition by Marxists (and some non-Marxist scholars) to apologetic conceptions of capitalism is bearing fruit. It is also proof that the reality of existing antagonistic classes and social inequality have their effect, for they are ever present in a bourgeois society. That classes exist is especially made clear by the intensified struggle of the proletariat, which neither politicians nor bourgeois theorists can ignore.

The authors deal with a wide range of problems, and adduce facts and figures to show that the changes evident over the past half-century in incomes distribution have been very limited and have not removed the contradictions between the working class and capital. Taxation and the widely advertised measures to establish the "welfare state" resulted only in a "redistribution" of incomes within classes but not between them. The authors' conclusions, based on analysis of the problem of power in capitalist society, convincingly refute the theory of "pluralism" of power, which in bourgeois society is wielded by "capital with its associates" (p. 252). The authors also examine in detail published (and unpublished) data on social mobility in postwar Britain, concluding that, to all intents and purposes, this changes nothing in the division of society into opposing classes.

This "valuable book" (*Morning Star*, Feb. 5, 1976) debunks the propaganda myths current in bourgeois sociology and widespread among the British public. The basic varieties of these myths relating to each of the problems dealt with in the book are summarised at the beginning of the corresponding chapters and are critically examined. As a rule, the authors examine each of the problems, making critical use of official and other sources and of all the more profound sociological and economic studies.[2] This fortifies the credibiliy of their conclusions.

This study, however, provides only an "anatomy", the composition and boundaries of classes and social strata in Britain. On the whole, the authors correctly place property owners, directors, top executives and officials in the class of capitalists. But the question of the "elite professions" remains unclear (Westergaard and Resler consider them to be part of the ruling class). Undoubtedly, the "elite of the elite" includes top lawyers, some scholars, etc., directly connected with big business, enjoying sizeable "capitalist" incomes, and socially intertwined with the capitalists. However, it would be right to regard most members of the "elite professions", along with the wider group of intellectuals (engineers, research workers and lower and middle-level managerial staff) as part of the middle strata.

The book devotes inadequate attention to the "middle bourgeoisie", though it is they, the owners of enterprises and the managers, who make up the "mass" of the bourgeois class.

In the chapters on the working class, the authors, again using a wealth of factual material, show the proximity of office employees and related groups to the workers, while noting the existing objective, and especially subjective, differences between them.

On the whole, the book provides a convincing picture of class inequality in Britain, showing how important it is today for Marxist researchers to focus attention on a general theoretical and concrete analysis of the social structure of modern bourgeois society. This would provide a better picture of the classes and social groups in capitalist society, and a deeper understanding of their real (and potential) interests, which, in turn, would help devise a strategy of radical social change.

Valentin Peschansky

---

[1] See reviews in *The Times Literary Supplement*, March 12, 1976, and *New Society*, November 6, 1976.

[2] Mention should be made of some of the works not used by the authors, such as publications of the Labour Research Department, and the following books dealing with classes and inequality in Britain: A. Grant, *Socialism and the Middle Classes*, London, Lawrence & Wishart, 1958; S. Aaronovitch, *Monopoly*, London, Lawrence & Wishart, 1955. Idem, *The Ruling Class*, London, Lawrence & Wishart, 1961.

These books use less material and do not examine the problems in such detail, but the authors were among the first to criticise the very myths exploded by Westergaard and Resler. An interesting book by H. Frankel on British society, *Capitalist Society and Modern Sociology* (London, Lawrence & Wishart, 1970) is mentioned in a footnote.

The Party Press

Information from and about the GCP

ILLUSTRATED broadsheets under this title in German, English, French, Spanish, Italian and Russian were distributed by German Communist Party activists at the Frankfurt-am-Main book fair. "Persecuted for their convictions" is the heading of one item which reads in part: "Notwithstanding the principles expressly set out in the Constitution, members of the GCP are not allowed to teach in schools or higher educational establishments. The notorious *Berufsverbote* (denial of jobs to persons with Communist views) is being applied with a vengeance....

"The GCP protests against this impairment of democratic rights. We believe that after the Helsinki Conference there should be no discrimination on political grounds. The *Berufsverbote* is contrary to the spirit of Helsinki."

W. Becker

Mundo Obrero and *Treball* Reach Spanish Readers

IN Palma-de-Malorca some 300 Spanish Communists led by Francisca Bosh, the head of the Party organisation on the Balearic Islands, openly sold *Mundo Obrero*, the central Communist journal, on the streets.

It is also being openly sold in central Madrid. The police arrested several distributors but were forced to release them under public pressure.

In Barcelona and its suburbs *Treball*, the central organ of the United Socialist Party of Catalonia, is being openly sold by groups of Party activists.

Both papers have increased their circulation, *Treball* to 15,000 and *Mundo Obrero* to 100,000.

Lina Argenti

New Publications

THE Central Committee of the Somali Revolutionary Socialist Party has begun publication of a theoretical and political monthly, *Halgan* (the Struggle), in the Somali and English languages, with an Arabic edition to come out at a later date. The journal will analyse and explain the Party's policy and decisions. It will devote much space to extending and strengthening contacts with the international Communist and workers' movement, the socialist countries and the national-liberation movement, and will carry interpretative summaries of the revolutionary experience of peoples working towards a socialist society.

The editorial in the inaugural issue says *Halgan* will be guided by Lenin's definition of the role of the Party press: "A journal is not only a collective propagandist and collective agitator, but also a collective organiser." An article by Mohamed Adan Sheikh, member of the Party Central Committee, is devoted to the seventh anniversary of the Somali revolution, and there are also articles on the Party's new programme, the training of its political cadres, and the present stage in the liberation struggle in Southern Africa.

N. K.

THE first copies of a new weekly *Patria* have appeared in Honduras. The editorial in the first issue says that *Patria*, as previous Communist publications, will defend the working people's interests. "Some would say that we are again taking up the fight," says the editorial. "This is not so, because we have never retreated from the struggle. On the contrary, we say we are again among old friends, our readers for over twenty *years*.... *Just* as before, the paper will analyse life today, our people's social, political and economic problem. This is a serious paper that will always speak the truth. Drawing on the support and enthusiasm of the masses, the Honduran Communists, even in the hardest times, never ceased putting out their paper: replacing each other, *Vanguardia revolucionaria*, *Adelante*, and now *Patria*, invariably remained true to their motto, "The press in the service of the people and truth."

Ema Perez

Special Issues

THE Communist press is countering the anti-Soviet campaign mounted of late by bourgeois propaganda. "The Soviet Union resolutely supports the struggle of peoples and governments for full national independence" is the banner headline of the 16-page special issue of *Tribuna Popular*, organ of the Communist Party of Venezuela. It is devoted entirely to the USSR and the home and foreign policy of the CPSU. "Three times as many engineers as the US has", "There is no unemployment", "575,000 new flats in 6 months", "The CPSU is the Party of the whole people" these are some of the headings in this special issue.

Another Latin American newspaper, *Voz Proletaria*, organ of the CP Colombia, has issued a special supplement on the Soviet Union. An article by the Party's General Secretary, Gilberto Vieira, says that thanks to the efforts of the CPSU, "the peoples of the world can look to the future with confidence, to a future of more durable peace, more energetic mass struggle against reactionary and fascist regimes, more victories by the democratic forces in the complex process of national and social emancipation of peoples exploited and oppressed by monopoly capitalism." The supplement includes Leonid Brezhnev's speech at the October 1976 CC CPSU plenum, and also these articles: "The Dynamics of the Two Systems' Economic Competition", "Targets of the 10th Five-Year Plan", "Women in Soviet Society", "Child Care", "Freedom of Creativity and Partisanship".

Mariana Martin

Co-ordinating Publishing Work

DIRECTORS of Party publishing houses in Bulgaria, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, GDR, Hungary, Mongolia, Poland, Rumania and the Soviet Union attended a conference in Prague. "Our work," said Evzen Poloncy, Director of the CC CPCz Publishing House *Svoboda*, "was aimed at perfecting co-operation on the basis of the decisions of recent congresses of the fraternal parties of the socialist countries."

The participants were interested mainly in seeing that our book publishing policy be more effective in developing Marxist-Leninist theory, in combating revisionist and bourgeois ideology, establishing the socialist way of life, and

popularising congress decisions of the fraternal parties. Problems of joint publication were likewise discussed.

The 60th anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution will be marked by new publications in each country. Information was exchanged on preparations for the anniversary.

Erick Dort

Journal Anniversary

THE ideological journal of the Communist Party of Colombia, *Documentos politicos*, marked its 20th anniversary. The journal has come out regularly despite difficult underground conditions. All-told, over this 20-year period 122 issues were printed. Its materials provide a Marxist analysis of the domestic and international situation, expose the various forms of imperialist domination, describe the workers' struggle, economic problems and questions of national culture. A large part of the journal is devoted to the struggle for the unity of the international Communist and working-class movement on the principles of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism.

A. M.

World Peace Council Scroll of Honour for WMR

AT its session in Sofia on February 11-12 the Presidential Committee of the World Peace Council (WPC) adopted a decision to award a Scroll of Honour to *World Marxist Review* (Problems of Peace and Socialism). A telegram from Romesh Chandra, WPC Secretary General, notes the journal's consistent efforts over the years to spread and popularise the noble ideas of a durable, democratic and just peace. In its decision the WPC Presidential Committee emphasised that the award was in recognition of the journal's outstanding contribution to the promotion of detente, to the struggle for disarmament and national independence, against imperialism, colonialism, neocolonialism, racism and exploitation, for social progress and a new and happy life for all peoples.

In a cabled reply to the World Peace Council the Editorial Board and Editorial Council of the journal, on behalf of its multinational staff and readers, expressed cordial gratitude for the award and for the WPC Presidential Committee's high assessment of the journal's contribution to the struggle for peace and social progress. They said they would redouble their efforts to popularise noble ideas and goals that would inspire the peoples to build a durable, just and democratic peace.

English edition of

PROBLEMS OF PEACE AND SOCIALISM

Theoretical and information journal of Communist and Workers' Parties throughout the world

PUBLISHED IN PRAGUE WORKERS OF ALL LANDS UNITI

VOLUME 20 MAY 1977 NO. !

CONTENTS

Viewpoints

The Press

PROBLEMS OF PEACE AND SOCIALISM

is also published in Arabic, Bengali, Bulgarian, Czech, Danish, Finnish, French, German, Greek, Hebrew, Hindi, Hungarian, Italian, Japanese, Malayalam, Mongolian, Norwegian, Persian, Polish, Portuguese, Punjabi, Romanian, Russian, Singhalese, Spanish, Swedish, Tamilnad, Turkish and Vietnamese.

Enquiries for subscriptions to any of these editions should be sent to Press Circulation Agency, Thakurova 3, 16616 Prague 6, Czechoslovakia.

Published by S. C. Easton, 16 King Street, London, W.C.2., and printed by Farleigh Press (T.U.) Ltd., Watford

The Helsinki Agreements and the Struggle for Peace

ROMESH CHANDRA
Secretary-General, World Peace Council

MAN has always associated his innermost aspirations with just and lasting peace. The agreements reached at the Helsinki Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe (CSCE) and recorded in its Final Act, which was signed almost two years ago by thirty-three states of Europe and by the United States and Canada, are an expression of the people's resolve to banish war from the life of society, an expression of their desire to use the inexhaustible material and spiritual potentialities of mankind through economic, scientific, technological and cultural co-operation among nations with different social systems.

The time that has passed since is short in terms of history. But it is enough to satisfy anyone of the wisdom of the leaders of socialist states and the political foresight of some of the statesmen of capitalist countries who overcame great obstacles and differences and agreed to develop international relations on the principles of peaceful coexistence, to carry forward detente. There is growing evidence that the Helsinki peace charter gave a powerful spur to the struggle of the peoples of every continent for detente, disarmament, national independence and social progress.

The peoples of Europe played a decisive role in preparations for the Helsinki summit. The Europe from where the two world wars came, the Europe from where the armies of colonialism marched to enslave and kill people in various parts of the globe, but where also scientific socialism was born, the Great October Revolution took place and the socialist system came into existence, has taken the first steps to change the political and psychological climate of the world and discard cold war in favour of detente.

A set of treaties and agreements relating to the German problem made it possible to ease tension in the heart of Europe by removing the issue of national frontiers from the European agenda. It confirmed the political realities resulting from World War II and the defeat of fascist Germany. Growing relations between the socialist and non-socialist countries of Europe show not only the possibilities of expanding mutually beneficial peaceful co-operation between states with different social systems, but the opportunities which this co-operation affords for the solution of pressing European problems, such as those of energy, raw materials or transport. The signing of the Helsinki Final Act, made possible by the experience gained, paved the way for a better Europe.

Furthermore, ever since Helsinki, the people that have won or are winning freedom have looked upon Europe in a different way. They no longer see it only as the continent of the fascists and colonialists, only as the Europe which produced wars, death and destruction and from whose western part colonialism still spreads; they also see Europe now as the continent which took important steps for detente, giving mankind greater hope of durable, just and democratic peace.

It would be wrong, therefore, to think that the Helsinki Conference was an action carried out in Europe and only for Europe. This would be a narrow

approach preventing a proper view of today's world in all its interconnections, in all its complexity and multiformity, and underrating the world significance of the CSCE, *the role of those who made the Conference possible and created the spirit* expressed in its Final Act. The CSCE and its Final Act are indicative of a new balance of world forces. They would have been impossible without the tremendous contribution of all peoples to the formation of detente, to the worldwide struggle for peace, freedom, independence and social progress, against war, imperialism and fascism.

In speaking of this contribution, even in the most general terms, I must also note the important role played by the gains of the national liberation movement, first of all the signal victory of the peoples of Vietnam, Laos and Kampuchea, by the vast movement of solidarity with Indochina, with the Chilean and other peoples struggling against fascism, by the non-aligned countries and the peace movement in all countries.

Therefore, it is fair to say that while the Final Act was only signed by the participants in the CSCE, it is also a result of the efforts of all peoples and impinges on the destiny of the whole of mankind.

Detente is neither the product, nor the patrimony of one continent. It is not a tree which grows on one continent and nowhere else. It greatly contributes to lessening the threat of war in every part of the world. Peace supporters perceive detente as a global process of putting international relations on a sound basis. To be sure, it is a complex and contradictory process extending over a long period, for to move on from the distrust and fear of the cold war years to normal relations between countries based on mutual confidence and readiness to settle differences and disputes not by force, threats or sabre-rattling, but by negotiation on the principles of equality, justice and respect for the other side's legitimate interests is no easy task.

Helsinki opened the perspective of an end to the arms race, of co-operation in Europe, of better living standards for the population of Europe. All this is also vital for the rest of the world not only because of the importance of Europe, but because the example of solving European problems one by one shows the way to lessening tensions in other areas of the world.

Just as all peoples contributed to the success of the CSCE, so the Helsinki spirit creates new possibilities, new favourable conditions for every people fighting for a new life, against imperialism, fascism, racism, oppression and injustice. The efforts of the peoples of Europe to consolidate the Helsinki gains are inseparable from the struggle of the peoples of the world for peace and social progress. In particular, they are linked with the struggle of the peoples of the developing countries, who want to take their natural resources into their own hands, end hunger and poverty, attain economic independence and rid themselves of oppression. The struggle to abolish fascism in Chile and beat off the offensive of fascism in other Latin American countries, such as Brazil, Uruguay, Paraguay, Bolivia, Guatemala, Haiti or Nicaragua, is likewise a task going beyond that continent. It is an internationalist duty of world opinion, a duty inseparable from our struggle in Asia, Africa and, above all, Europe. There is a direct connection between the struggle of the peoples of Europe for the materialisation of the Helsinki agreements and the Arab peoples' struggle for peace and justice in the Middle East, the battles of the Palestine people for their inalienable rights, including the right to establish their own state.

The Helsinki spirit has provided the peoples of South Africa, Namibia and Zimbabwe with new opportunities to march forward to victories. Their struggle for independence contributes vitally to the struggle for an end to the arms race and for disarmament. In turn, the struggle to end the arms race is equally vital to the struggle for independence. We do not say: Wait till there is disarmament, and then we shall all be independent and free. Nor do we accept the other—totally false—idea that until every country is free, the struggle for disarmament is meaningless.

Lastly, an atmosphere of detente creates opportunities for mankind to solve such universal problems as those of food, the environment or raw materials. From this point of view, man's future depends directly on whether he will succeed in curbing the forces of war and reaction, stop the arms race and gear the funds and human energy to be rleased as a result to the implementation of far-reaching social programmes.

All peace supporters need to see these links clearly if they are to draw correct lessons from the Helsinki Conference, which can and should become the catalyst of a chain reaction of detente encompassing the whole world.

It would be hard nowadays to come across a politician calling explicitly for war. However, this is not to say that the enemies of detente and the Helsinki spirit, those who tried to block preparations for the CSCE and then to torpedo the Conference itself, have downed arms. They have simply changed their tactics.

This change is so instructive in itself as to be worth dwelling on. It may be recalled that before the CSCE met, its opponents said it would fail. And as they could not discredit the Conference, they ignored its documents, alleging that it had achieved nothing. The publicity given to the Helsinki principles compelled them to claim that the Final Act gave "advantages" to one side (not theirs) and that, in any case, it could not be implemented. And now they pretend to support the Helsinki accords, saying that they uphold the Helsinki spirit against the "Soviet threat".

Nothing can conceal the actual state of affairs—the campaign over the so-called "Soviet threat" is a counter-offensive against detente and, first of all, against disarmament, that is, against what all the peoples are vitally interested in.

The campaign is also designed to undermine public confidence in the sincerity of the intentions and fruitfulness of the activity of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries committed to the cause of detente and disarmament.[1]

No amount of propaganda camouflage, no change of masks on the political scene, will help the latter-day "defenders" of the Helsinki spirit to disguise their identity. These are spokesmen of the forces responsible for the aggression in the Middle East, for the fact that the people of Palestine are denied their sovereign rights, for keeping alive the hated colonialist and racist regimes in southern Africa for the coup d'etat in Chile and continuing efforts to "destabilise" certain Latin American countries, for attempts to perpetuate the division of Korea, for the lingering tensions on our planet, for the appearance of new imperialist military bases, for the arms race, for arms deliveries to reactionary regimes.

It is obvious to any sensible person that the allegation about the "Soviet military threat" is intended to justify more military spending in some Western countries. In 1976, the West European NATO countries increased their military budgets by $5,000 million. The United States had a record military budget of $113,000 million in 1976.

For those who profit from armaments, detente is "all right" provided it does not affect their profits nor stop them from increasing these profits. They resort to frontal attacks and turning movements against the solemn undertaking given by their governments at Helsinki to promote detente in the military sphere, against the wishes of the overwhelming majority of their peoples, on whom mounting military budgets put an increasing burden, making their daily lives harder and forcing them to work more for a livelihood.

Militarisation of the economy, far from reducing unemployment in capitalist countries, aggravates the situation on the labour market. To divert the masses from the real causes of the imperialist crisis, some Western politicians seize on various subterfuges. In particular, they try to discredit socialism, and this is the real aim of the campaign over "human rights" in the socialist countries, which the enemies of detente are conducting on the plea of concern for the implementation of the "third basket" of the Final Act (co-operation in humanitarian fields).

The socialist countries scrupulously implement the provisions of this section of the Final Act, as every unbiassed analyst will admit. I am sure this will also be seen by those honest people who may have been misled by vicious propaganda. What is perfectly clear is that in this instance, the imperialists are by no means concerned with the "third basket". What do they care for human rights? Had they really been concerned about human rights, they could find a more suitable sphere for their efforts in their own countries instead of brazenly interfering in the affairs of other countries. They would be better advised to provide the many millions of jobless persons in the capitalist world with a real right to work. Bourgeois "humanists" should also go on from words to deeds in the matter of completely eliminating racism, apartheid, fascism and religious fanaticism, whose victims lack civil rights. Lastly, one feels like asking the champions of "absolute freedoms" how much longer they intend to shut their eyes to the fact that reaction steps up the persecution of Communists and democrats and jails dissenters, including peace fighters.

Those behind the campaign are prompted by anything but concern for human rights. Their aim is to conceal the real state of affairs as regards human rights in the capitalist world, to create the impression that the struggle for a just reorganisation of society is useless because human rights are "denied" everywhere. It follows that the torture and terror in Chile or the shootings of African workers in South Africa are only part of a widespread "universal phenomenon" which in these cases has perhaps taken somewhat sharper forms. This falsehood is meant to justify the unjustifiable. The anti-Soviet, anti-socialist campaign is being used as a means of undermining the world-wide movement of solidarity with the victims of crimes against humanity in countries ruled by fascist and neofascist regimes. But its primary purpose is to minimise the experience of the country of the October Revolution, to reduce the appeal of the Soviet Union, make the people a passive, apolitical onlooker and divert them from the struggle against social injustice, unemployment and inflation and their causes. By using lies, imperialism tries to prevent the people from coming to the inevitable conclusion that they cannot exercise the ordinary human right to eat and work or take care of their health, or develop their spiritual values, unless they transform society.

I was born in India in the decade after the October Revolution changed the world. My people, with whom I fought for independence, gained so much from

the *October* Revolution. They gained in inspiration and support. My people fought heroically for their freedom. But how much harder would this struggle have been and how much greater the toll of sacrifice had it not gone on in the epoch initiated by the October Revolution and had it not enjoyed the unqualified solidarity of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries.

The October Revolution is part of my life, part of the life of my beloved motherland. This is why millions of people in India and other countries, particularly the peoples of the developing non-aligned countries, see the current anti-Communist smear campaign in its true light. For only the blind can fail to see that reaction wants to weaken the unity of peace forces and, no less important, to dissociate the non-aligned countries from their best friends, the Soviet Union and other socialist countries.

Reshaping international relations on democratic principles—an effort to which the Soviet Union and the socialist community as a whole make the greatest contribution—is imperative today. It will be effective only if all governments and peoples and all social forces join earnestly in it.

Recently I read Leonid Brezhnev's introduction to a volume of his speeches and writings published in France. The General Secretary of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union wrote: "I should like to stress here one thing only. It is not enough to say that we want peace. We want lasting peace. We not only want it but are doing everything in our power to achieve this goal. And lasting peace is conceivable only as a just, democratic and truly universal peace. In other words, a peace based not on the premise that 'might is right', but on the equality and freedom of all peoples and states, big and small, industrially developed and still developing. Such a peace would accord with the interests of all and at the same time with the interests of each."[2]

These simple words show what the peace movement is all about.

But what is this peace we are striving for? Not a peace based on the balance of terror or on power and might over those who do not have them. We want a peace which is in the interests of all and in the interests of each. It is a feasible task. What is our optimism based on? It is based, first of all, on the strength of the bulwark of peace which socialism has become. Championing peace along with the socialist countries are the young independent states. The peoples of the capitalist countries, for their part, have an objective stake in detente.

In 1936, when we were fighting against the dangers of fascism and of a second world war, Georgi Dimitrov said: "We need a peace front spreading over all parts of the world, from Tokyo to London, from New York to Berlin. . . . We must gird the globe with such a network of peace organisations, with so powerful an international solidarity movement, and adopt such effective actions of united international proletarian policy with a view to maintaining peace as to stay the warmongers' criminal hand". But in the thirties this Communist call was drowned by the roar of guns. Nevertheless, the lessons of World War II were not lost. Looking back at the main stages of the peace movement, we see how much has been achieved in these years, how greatly the situation today differs from what it was in 1936. Due to the changed balance of forces on the planet, the policy of peaceful coexistence and detente now plays a decisive role in international life and determines its main trends. We have succeeded in encircling the globe with a network of organisations of peace champions and in strengthening the international solidarity movement.

An indication of these changes is the activity of the World Peace Council. Ou ranks have multiplied. The most diverse political forces have been able to com together and join the World Peace Council. In many countries, the nationa peace movements increasingly assume the character of a front, or a united bod embracing all who love their country and stand against imperialism and fascism and that means the vast majority of the people of each country.

The initiatives of this period taken by the World Peace Council to mobilis world opinion consisted, first of all, in pressing forward the campaign for mor signatures to the Stockholm Appeal against the Arms Race, for Disarmament stepping up the effort to speed social and economic progress in the newl independent states in the climate of detente and extending the front of solidarit with the peoples of Chile, South Africa, Cyprus and other countries. Th influence of the peace forces and the appeal of the ideas advocated by them hav grown to such an extent that politicians, MPs and whole governments ar compelled to reckon with them.

Under pressure from public opinion, a number of West European statesmen are coming to the conclusion that the national interests of their countries ar irreparably damaged by accepting what NATO demands, which means buildin up armaments. It is becoming more and more difficult for Western politicians to ignore public opinion, which insists on cutting military budgets, as the Sovie Union has repeatedly done in the past and continues to do.

In reply to the growing demands of peace supporters in the United States President Jimmy Carter, for his part, pledged himself time and again during hi election campaign and after taking office to cut down the US military budget These pledges have yet to be implemented but the fact remains that they wer made.

What Georgi Dimitrov said more than forty years ago is still valid. In today' circumstances, we must expand the network of organisations of peac champions and foster international solidarity. A powerful peace movement i what was needed then and is needed now. Our task is not only to defend peace not only to stay the hands of those who would bring back the cold war and eve the hot war. The new period of detente has set us new tasks and this entitles us to call ourselves peace builders. We need a vast network of peace organisations als for the purpose of building the new world we all seek.

The year 1977 may become largely decisive in this respect. It will se negotiations on important and promising lines of world politics. Mankind pin great hopes on the second round of Soviet-US strategic aims limitation talks. I also looks forward to progress in the Vienna talks among 19 countries on cuts in armed forces and armaments in Central Europe. Besides, it is imperative to resume the Geneva talks with a view to ending the war of aggression in th Middle East. The Belgrade meeting of the foreign ministers of the countrie which attended the Helsinki Conference should contribute to security in Europe.

A pressing demand of today is to launch a world offensive of peace supporters It is essential that peace supporters the world over should campaign for th reinforcement and promotion of the Helsinki spirit, for the full implementatio of the CSCE Final Act, for new initiatives. They must ensure that detent becomes irreversible. Frederic Juliot-Curie, founder of the World Peac Council, said that "one people alone, let alone one individual, cannot eliminat the threat of war. Only the joint efforts of the peoples of all countries will make it possible to achieve this goal."

This is the spirit which guides the national and international peace movements. There can be no question of one or several movements imposing their point of view on others. But we are aware that the most important thing at the moment is the unity of the peace forces. We need this unity more than ever, more perhaps than before the Helsinki Final Act, because today's counter-offensive of the cold warriors is not just one more counter-offensive but a very dangerous operation. And yet it cannot succeed—it will be defeated by the will and power of the peoples.

One year before Helsinki, we said: "The Conference is going to take place, and it is going to be a success." Some people laughed, saying that we were living in a fool's paradise. But today we repeat that we shall go forward to new gains for the cause of peace.

Together we can do this.

* * *

Attaching great importance to discussion of the problems raised by WPC Secretary-General Romesh Chandra in his article, the Editorial Council of th journal intends to continue dealing with the role of various factors impinging o the state and evolution of international relations. It plans, among other things, t cover the following themes: the socialist community as the driving force o favourable changes in the world; factors promoting or hampering internationa detente; peace as an indispensable condition for the social and economic progres of the developing countries; the contribution of the non-alignment movement t the reshaping of international relations; joint actions by diverse political trend to end the arms race; calculations and miscalculations of imperialism's militaris circles; international solidarity in the struggle against seats of fascism.

[1] The campaign over the so-called "military threat" of the Soviet Union has another purpose, too and to this I would like to draw attention. This purpose is to mislead public opinion in the non aligned countries, to create the impression that there is an arms race for which "two sides" ar responsible. Behind this screen of falsehoods, arms on a massive scale are being poured into thir world countries, above all by the US armaments profiteers. Some of these countries are now acting a gendarmes of imperialism by way of "paying" for the arms deliveries. Others are becoming more an more dependent on imperialism as a result of these arms supplies, and their advance toward economic independence is slowing down accordingly.

[2] *New Times*, No. 2, 1977.

Government by the People

JOHN PITTMAN
CC Political Bureau member, CPUSA
SATYAJAYA SUDIMAN
Leadership member, CP Indonesia

How the Soviets Work

THIS year marks the 60th anniversary of the power of the Soviets. The Russian word "soviet" means "council" and when we speak of the Soviets of Working People's Deputies we mean the elected representative bodies on which government in the USSR is based. The Soviet Union itself, the world's first socialist state, takes its name from these soviets. During a recent visit to the country we were able to study the everyday functioning of the Soviets at all levels, first in the Republic of Turkmenistan (one of the 15 socialist republics comprising the USSR), and later in the Supreme Soviet of the USSR itself. We visited towns and villages, collective farms and factories, met voters and their deputies, observed the work of the executive committees of the Soviets and their permanent commissions and activists, took part in sessions, examined documents and interviewed members of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Turkmenistan and the Presidiums of the Supreme Soviets of this Republic and of the USSR.

All we have seen and heard has led us to this conclusion: the Soviets, which Lenin even before the October Revolution saw as the embryo of the new form of people's government, have in the 60 years since the revolution grown into a powerful force and become mass organisations through which genuine people's power is exercised. As Lenin wrote, "It is the people, who even in the most democratic bougeois republics, while possessing equal rights by law, have in fact been debarred by thousands of devices and subterfuges from participation in political life and enjoyment of democratic rights and liberties, that are now drawn into constant and unfailing, moreover decisive participation in the domestic administration of the state." (*Coll. Works,* Vol. 28, p. 465). We saw to our satisfaction how, thanks to the consistent development of socialist democracy under the guidance of the CPSU, the present system of Soviets guarantees and gives practical expression to the full functioning of people's power.

In this report of our impressions we shall try to deal in detail with the key points in the organisations and activity of the organs of Soviet power, starting from the elections and continuing through the work of the deputies, the Soviets themselves and their commissions up to the Supreme Soviet presidium, which performs the functions of a "collegiate president".

A Desert Republic

This was the first time we had actually seen Turkmenistan, the USSR's southernmost republic. In the first Soviet years its territory was populated by nearly 1 million, including over 700,000 Turkmen. Its population today is 2.7

nillion, of whom 1.5 million are Turkmen. We knew that sixty years ago it had)een a desolate and remote border area of the Russian empire, but we had no :oncrete idea of what life was really like here in those not so distant days.

Was it a state? No, right up to the time of the October Revolution of 1917, the Turkmen had no statehood. In fact, they were not even a nation. The formation of the Turkmen nation out of scattered tribes came later.

Were there any cities? On the eve of the revolution, on all the places marked on he map there lived less than a thousand Turkmen. When a traveller asked where he people lived he received the answer, "In the saddles of their camels".

What about industry? The best it could offer was the railway workshops. Before the revolution 5,500 people were employed in industry and of these only 50 were Turkmen.

Agriculture? Nine-tenths of Turkmenistan was desert; the few irrigation ystems were in the hands of feudal landlords. As for agricultural implements, here was a total of 64 ploughs.

Education? The only Turkmen woman who received a higher education before he Revolution was a girl who had been adopted by a Russian general and taken iway from her native land. The illiterate were 983 per thousand of the)opulation. Official statistics on literacy led the Russian magazine *Vestnik ʼospitaniya* (Education Herald) to predict in 1906 that it would take 4,600 years to solve this problem in Central Asia.

Socialism has changed all that. The country that greeted us was quite a different Turkmenistan.

Last year they had an unusually severe winter. It prevented us from enjoying vhat might be described as the most exotic item on our programme—a peedboat trip across the desert. The Lenin Kara-Kum Canal, the world's longest lesert waterway, which runs through Turkmenia, was frozen over for the first ime in its history. We stood on its banks with their fringe of rust-coloured ·ushes, we saw the irrigated fields, and we visited the collective and state farms hat now produce an annual cotton crop of over a million tons.

The Marii Hydro-Electric Station, the biggest in Central Asia, is going up on he banks of the canal. Part of it is already in operation and produces 630,000 kw. When completed, the station will have a capacity of 1,370,000 kw. While we were here, an order came and the operator stepped up the load by 10,000 kw. The vhole of Turkmenia was not making that much electricity in 1913.

The republic's oil and gas industry lies in the western area, near the shores of he Caspian Sea. On the road from Nebit-Dag to Kum-Dag we ran into a ıandstorm so violent that we couldn't open the car door on the windward side ınd the oil rigs were actually bowed by the wind. Turkmenistan yields about 15 nillion tons of oil and one-fifth of the Soviet Union's output of gas.

In short, anyone revisiting the country after a break of half a century would ıave found very little that was at all familiar, except perhaps the tomb of Sultan Sanjar that has loomed over the desert for eight centuries. So in answer to the question, what has Soviet power given Turkmenistan, one can reply quite briefly ınd without any risk of exaggeration—everything you see around you. However, this implies big advances towards a new pattern of life and also new problems, new difficulties that cannot be solved without further dedicated work.

"Throughout the history of our republic," C. S. Karriyev, Secretary of the Turkmen Communist Party's Central Committee, stated, "the activity of the Soviets has been determined by the objectives placed before the country by the

Communist Party. Its decisions constitute the political programme of Soviet power, which is totally dedicated to serving the people's interests."

How is this power actually exercised?

Elections

In the USSR there are more than 50,000 Soviets at the various levels, from the villages to the centre. They have 2.2 million deputies. The first thing we investigated was how they are elected.

Since the first days of socialism it has been a principle, laid down in the electoral law of the country and faithfully observed, that all elections to the Soviets are to be held "on the basis of universal, equal and direct suffrage by secret ballot." *(Constitution of the USSR.* Article 134). In Turkmenistan, as throughout the country, everyone who has reached the age of 18 has the right to vote, irrespective of race, nationality, sex, religious belief, social origin, property status or past activities. The law makes only two exceptions, for people who have been medically certified as insane and for those sentenced by a court of law to forfeiture of their electoral rights.

"You have come just when we are starting our preparations for the current elections to the local Soviets," we were told by Ann-Mukhmed Klychev, President of the Presidium of Turkmenistan's Supreme Soviet. "Deputies to the Soviets hold office for two years and there will be new elections this summer.

"By preparations we mean making a preliminary summing up of the work done by the Soviet in its current term, so that people can see who of their deputies has come up to expectations and deserves to be nominated for another term, and who should not be. After every election the composition of the Soviets is usually renewed by 30 to 50 per cent. Preparing for the elections also means that the working people start setting up the election commissions; the next step is to nominate the candidates, then comes a careful checking of the electoral rolls so that every person can exercise his right to vote no matter where he may be on election day—on a long train journey, on some distant collective farm pasture, or in a prospector's tent in the middle of the desert. We make sure that everyone can cast his vote, but we see to it that no one casts two votes."

One of our group was from the United States and another from Indonesia and his account reminded us of how the last presidential elections were held in the USA and how the preparations for the parliamentary elections in Indonesia in May are being conducted.

In a certain sense the United States and Indonesia are opposite poles in respect of bourgeois democracy. The US ruling circles love to advertise their system as the world's freest society. On the other hand, the working people of the United States are certainly be proud of some solid democratic gains they have won in the course of stubborn class struggles. However, the enormous gap between promises and performance is the reality that inheres in the capitalist class nature of the American system. Whereas the regime in Indonesia states with brutal frankness that no Communists, or even those that are suspected of Communist sympathies, will be allowed to participate in the elections, the monopolies of the United States take a much more subtle line that suits them better. Democratic freedoms are acknowledged on paper but rarely practised. For example, the mechanics of the so-called two-stage electoral system created a situation in which only 53.3 per cent of the voters took part in the presidential elections last year.

In our view an election campaign under Soviet conditions is conducted on

fundamentally different lines. It is a powerful social movement. The masses (not merely "participate", they run the elections from beginning to end. Tl responsibility for conducting the elections is placed in the hands of t population.

The Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR passes the election statu but supervision of the ballot, deciding of controversial points, documentatio registration of candidates and counting of the votes, all fall within t competence of the central and local election commissions. The Presidium of t Supreme Soviet of Turkmenistan approves the composition of the republi Central Election Commission, but, like the local commissions, it has to composed of "representatives from the trade union organisations of facto office and professional workers, from the co-operative organisations, t Communist Party organisations, and youth organisations, and from cultur technical and scientific societies and other public organisations and societies working people. . . ."[1] During the last elections to Turkmenistan's local Sovi 90,000 people worked in the election commissions; of these 35.7 per cent we Communist Party members, and about 60 per cent factory workers and collecti farmers. In the USSR, 1,400,000 people worked on the election commissions f the elections to the present Supreme Soviet, and 10,000,000 on the commissio for the elections to the local Soviets.

Another specific feature of the Soviet system is the selection or nomination candidates for election, of those who are in future to express the people's wi Who, we asked, has the right to nominate candidates? And who does not ha that right? The operating organs of state power, in the person of the previo elected Soviets, do not have the right. The right is granted to "organisations a societies of working people: Communist Party organisations, trade unions, c operatives, youth organisations and cultural societies." *(Constitution of t USSR.* Article 141).

Bourgeois propaganda has been producing a good deal of falsehood distorti the Soviet electoral system. It is claimed, for example, that this system abolish the right of the individual to present himself as a candidate for election, that t voting is a purely formal process because there is only one candidate to choo from, and so on. Such claims, unfortunately, are quite often taken at their fa value.

What is the actual situation?

Yes, the practice is to nominate only one candidate for each electoral distri But now let us consider that practice a little more closely.

The candidate's nomination usually takes place at a general meeting, which normally held among the people where the candidate works. Before this t Party, trade union and Komsomol organisations have consulted the socia active members of the staff as to who is the best person to nominate. Wl criteria are used in this process and which are given priority?

"First of all," M. Mollayeva, Central Committee Secretary of the Turkm Communist Party, replied, "comes the respect in which a person is held by t people with whom he or she works. Second, the candidate's organising abili Third, his work record. And fourth, his ability to cope with the job".

And what about age, sex, social origin, party membership? None of th factors play a decisive part in any individual case. In general, they have to taken into account, so that the body of deputies as a whole is representative of sections and categories of the population.[2]

Now let us suppose we have named our candidate. Where is a person better known that at his or her place of work? A discussion begins. The candidate can be rejected. All that is needed is a straight majority of votes against him. We were *told at Turkmenistan's Supreme Soviet, in the* Marii Region and in Nebit-Dag that this does happen sometimes. In such cases a new candidate is nominated; anyone taking part in the meeting may propose one and no restriction of individual rights is allowed. After this the rule operates that for official registration a person's candidacy must be supported by a majority vote at a meeting that numerically represents more than half the work force. In this way democracy and creative initiative are happily combined.

After all, what real value is there in the boast of the bourgeois press that in New York's Union Square or London's Hyde Park anybody can tell the world he wants a certain person elected to Congress or Parliament? Nobody has ever got into Congress or Parliament that way, or ever will. The cult of individualism, of "individual liberties", is persistently fostered because it serves not democracy but the division of the working-class masses, whereas their success depends on their unity and solidarity. Historical experience fully confirms this lesson, namely: collectivism is the essential and best foundation for the realisation of individual civil rights and the common interests of the working people. Collectivism forms the bedrock of the Soviet system and it is natural that it plays a big part in elections.

After his official registration the candidate starts on his rounds of the voters. In the last elections to Turkmenistan's Supreme Soviet over 600,000 people, or more than half of the voters, attended election meetings. Detailed reports of such meetings are printed in the press, which means that everybody is able to form an opinion of the candidate. The final result is that the voters rarely make mistakes.

This, too, can be proved by facts.

The point is that Soviet laws do not free a deputy to a Soviet from responsibility, from accountability to the voters after his or her election. And these voters, this constituency, are working people. This, in our view, is one of the most important features of socialist democracy. After all, to whom is the member of parliament in capitalist countries accountable? Nominally, of course, to constituencies who also are working people, but actually to the monopolies, corporations, party bosses and other elements of the ruling class. Besides, the legislation and procedure of some capitalist countries actually release the deputy of any direct responsibility to account to his constituents. In countries where Communists are elected they value their ties with the masses because they are Communists, but the capitalist parliamentarian is not bound to give a strict account of himself to his constituents.

Soviet law, on the other hand, is quite definite on this point: "The deputy is responsible to his constituents and accountable to them."[3] The voters may at any time recall a deputy who has not justified their trust.

In capitalist parliamentary practice, despite all the scandalous exposures and investigations, all the reports of backstage manoeuvres, bribery and corruption among these elected "representatives of the tax-payers", the actual recall of a member of parliament is rare. Yet, in Turkmenistan we were told of several cases when the voters quite freely exercised their right to recall deputies. Last year, for example, three deputies were recalled from the Supreme Soviet of the Republic, and eight from the local Soviets. Official statistics for the country as a whole

confirm that this practice is routine. In the past ten years over 4,000 deputies have been recalled from the local Soviets, about a 100 from the Supreme Soviets of the Union and Autonomous republics, and since 1959, when the present procedure was introduced, eleven deputies have been recalled from the Supreme Soviet of the USSR. Among them were workers, collective-farm chairmen, and the secretary of a Party regional committee, recalled for as improper attitude to their duties as deputies, a breach of state laws, or acting in contrast with the moral principles and norms of Soviet society.

Arithmetically these figures are not very significant. But their political meaning is what is significant. It is a good thing when a mistake can be rectified; and even better when such mistakes are rare.

The Deputies

"Who's next, please?"

People come and go. Only we, who have asked special permission, sit on one side, watching Deputy Kuliyeva, of the Ashkhabad City Soviet, receiving her visitors.

In our travels through Turkmenia we could not help noticing that women hold posts on an equal footing with the men in government bodies, cultural institutions and management of the economy. In the republic's Supreme Soviet 35.3 per cent of the deputies are women and eight out of ten of these women are Turkmen. This is impressive not only because in our own countries women still have a long way to go in achieving equality (there are only 18 women among 535 members of the United States Congress, for instance, and in the Indonesian parliament, less than 5 per cent.)

The other striking fact is that this true equality is to be found here, in Central Asia, where only sixty years ago law and custom scarcely granted women the status of human being, let alone human rights. We heard about a Turkmen woman who was daring enough to be one of the first to take off the parandja, the horsehair veil. Her daughter now recalls what a storm of prejudice she had to endure. The daughter is now a secretary of the Central Committee of the Turkmen Communist Party.

In the Marii Region we met Gyzylgul Annamukhamedova, formerly a teacher and now a deputy to the Supreme Soviet of the USSR and chairman of the "Communism" collective farm. She became chairman in 1950 as a widow with two children on her hands, having lost her husband during the war. And she succeeded both in bringing up her sons and making a go of the farm. We visited this flourishing collective enterprise, which brings in an income of 5 million rubles a year. We saw the big village school where one of Annamukhamedova's sons teaches, and we also saw the memorial that the members of the farm had put up. It was wrapped in green cloth that flapped in the winter wind, but in spring it will be unveiled. On Victory Day, May 9th, the village will pay tribute to the memory of its people who died on the battlefields of World War II. Of the 300 men who went to the war from the village, 160 never returned.

We should like to pay homage, on the pages of this magazine, to our distant friends, to their national heroes, to the warriors and builders of socialism, to their splendid women.

At the city Soviet visitors were still coming. We took detailed notes on who came to see the deputy and what about, between the hours of 16.30 and 18.00 on

Wednesday, February 2: a housewife, member of a factory trade union committee, head doctor of a health centre, librarian, and a representative of the Tashkent Agricultural Machinery factory. The matters discussed were the repairing of ditches destroyed by a mud flow, the allotting of a recreation zone for the factory, the provision of housing for doctors, the organisation of hobby circles at the children's library, and the taking of orders by a dress-making establishment at people's place of work. All quite ordinary, everyday matters, but important nevertheless.

Every request and application was officially recorded. Deputy Kuliyeva promptly picked up the telephone and got in touch with the right people, then arranged with her visitors when they should contact her again. She made no extravagant promises, but all the promises she did make, and those of the authorities she contacted, were noted down for checking in future.

Receiving visitors regularly is only one of a deputy's duties. He or she is also bound to keep up correspondence and hold periodical meetings with constituents and report back to them. The deputy has to check up on the work of the factories and institutions in his area, study public opinion and current needs and cope with many other tasks, not to mention the work in the Soviet itself.

We met and talked to deputies at nearly all levels. In the village of Gyami, near Ashkhabad, we were invited to the home of A. Meredova, a schoolteacher and deputy of the village Soviet, and her sister S. Meredova, a collective farmer and deputy of the District Soviet. In Nebit-Dag we were the guests of S. Klychev, chief surgeon of the hospital, and E. P. Mulyavko, an oil rig operator, both deputies of the City Soviet. In the town of Marii we met the chairman of the executive committee of the Regional Soviet, Annayev and his colleagues. It was clear: the higher the "rank" of the Soviet, the more concerns it has.

We learnt more about the deputies of a USSR Supreme Soviet deputy from Yekaterina Shchekuteva, a deputy to the USSR Supreme Soviet from the Krasnaya Presnya Electoral District of Moscow. She holds a title of Merited School Teacher of the Russian Federation and now is a physics teacher. She is not a Party member. In the past she worked as a machine operator on a collective farm and technical inspector at a factory.

A deputy to the USSR Supreme Soviet, she told us, must study, among other things, quite a few draft laws, data on nominees for government posts with due regard to the situation in his or her particular district, and listen to the advice of experts and constituents on these matters. More, it is common practice that a Supreme Soviet deputy attends sessions of Soviets at lower levels in order to be in the picture as regards the day-to-day work of local government bodies on the territory whose interests the deputy represents in the supreme body of government.

When asked how much time she spent performing her duties as deputy and teacher, she said it was roughly "half and half". Her annual mail brings hundreds of letters, all of them to be answered. Also there are hundreds of visitors. This is nothing out of the ordinary. Contacts maintained by all the deputies are very numerous. Here are only a few general figures. In the 1971-75 period the USSR Supreme Soviet was visited by more than 100,000 people and received one million letters. Not all the applicants had justified complaints, but the fact that the response to 40 per cent of the applications was favourable was evidence of a thoughtful approach.

In addition to that, deputies must always keep in mind the electors' mandates. We must explain this, for in capitalist society there is nothing like the Soviet Union's institution of mandates.

Strictly speaking, it is not a deputy but a candidate for the office of deputy who receives mandates from the electorate. Mandates are not current applications, like those we heard about during the reception of local residents. A "mandate portfolio" is made up of collectively approved suggestions formulated at pre-election meetings. By the time the candidate becomes a deputy, the portfolio is full, and there will be a new one when the next elections come round. So, the proposals it contains are to be carried out before that date.

It is the custom to consider the mandates right at the first session of the Soviet, said D. Shahnazarov, Executive Committee Chairman at the Nebit-Dag Soviet. The mandates received by one or another deputy are compared, grouped and combined for execution by a Soviet. Some of them are rejected when found impracticable under the circumstances. The motives for such a decision, rare as it may be, are openly explained to the electorate. Of the 850,000 mandates forwarded to USSR local government bodies of the previous convocation, 822,000 were accepted, and 742,000, or 87.7 per cent, were carried out in due course. The local Soviets of Turkmenistan received 2,880 mandates, and 2,077 have already been carried out. The Ashkhabad City Soviet received 44 mandates, of which 37 were carried out before a quarter of the term expired.

Are there any representative bodies of bourgeois power that can say they fulfil ninety per cent of the obligations assumed?

Deputy to the Supreme Soviet of the USSR Shchekuteva has 14 mandates. What are they about? A new supply centre for school dining rooms opened in 1975; an outpatient clinic is being built, but the construction of a district House of Culture has yet to get off to a start.

There is no point in glossing over things. Nothing can be done too easily under any social systems. It takes work, including work by deputies.

In short, Soviet deputies have great responsibilities. Also, their rights and conditions for normal work are guaranteed.

The work of a deputy or, in the case of a deputy to the Supreme Soviet of the USSR or one of its constituent republics, a parliamentarian, is never a source of profit under socialism. Deputies are not paid for their work. The state compensates only their correspondence costs, and the like. While performing parliamentary duties they are temporarily relieved of their regular work (but are paid an average remuneration). Transportation is free for them and they enjoy priority rights at cultural and service establishments. Deputies are also given powers to exercise direct control of the processing of matters they are interested in and be present at all pertenent hearings. Administrators and officials must receive a deputy without delay. Deputies to the Supreme Soviets of the USSR and the republics also have the right to propose legislation and to address requests to the government. Lastly, they enjoy legal immunity, which means that no deputy can be arrested, tried, fired or demoted without the consent of the Soviet concerned.

Sessions

Officially, Turkmenistan's capital, Ashkhabad, is about a hundred years old but its actual age is slightly over 28 years: late at night on October 5, 1948, the city

was hit by a disastrous earthquake. In a documentary we were shown we saw smouldering ruins and people in grief. When this event was recalled in a talk at the office of A-M. Klychyov, President of the Presidium of Turkmenistan's Supreme Soviet, one of those present made a warning gesture asking us, as it were, to switch the conversation. In those tragic days Klychyov lost his two children. He was Chairman of the City Soviet when Ashkhabad was being rehabilitated.

As people said during the Tashkent earthquake in 1966, the Soviet republics in Central Asia live "on the back of a frenzied camel". In the recent period shocks in Ashkhabad sometimes reached 6 to 7 points on the Richter scale. But, except for a few broken windows, they did no harm.

Houses in new Ashkhabad look solid and beautiful. S. Saparov, who is Chairman of the City Soviet today, showed us the new streets, city gardens and houses. For the construction of one of those houses—the republican library—he and his two colleagues were awarded a State Prize. In Saparov's office, with construction diagrams and plans on the walls, we were told that since the 1948 earthquake the city population had increased 130 per cent, the residential area had grown 5.4-fold and industrial output shot up 380 per cent.

What is the role of the City Soviet in this effort?

The week before our visit the Executive Council of the Soviet was reviewing the builders' preparedness to start the next stage of city construction according to plan. Some criticism was addressed to the Ministry of Construction, which had worked according to a "total construction" scheme, while the selective method, that is, construction by districts, was more in the interests of the city. And measures were taken in response to the criticism addressed by the builders to the city authorities.

Our talk at the Ashkhabad City Soviet was frank and friendly. We were told about the city's needs and the problems they have not yet been able to cope with. They told us, for example, that there is still a waiting list for new, modern flats because building organisations are not yet up to strength. But everybody knows where he stands on that list and priority is given to those in special need, people with big families, the disabled, war veterans and also to workers with a distinguished labour record.

Twice during our trip we were able to observe the work of the Soviets actually in progress. In our presence the executive committee of an Ashkhabad district Soviet discussed the preparations for the spring sowing at the Makhtum-Kuli collective farm, and the executive committee of the Nebit-Dag City Soviet reviewed the work of th public libraries. In both cases the discussion was businesslike and critical and at the same time there was an atmosphere of goodwill and concern for people's welfare. The decisions taken while we were there included a recommendation that 28 of the citizens of Nebit-Dag should be awarded the Veteran of Labour medal. The executive committee also considered an application from a young woman, A. Rajapova, requesting to be appointed guardian of her younger sisters and brothers, who had recently become orphans; the request was granted and in addition the executive committee offered material assistance and care for the family's future. The Soviet would immediately apply for the young woman's husband to be recalled from army service to help look after them.

While we were in Nebit-Dag there was also a general meeting of the Soviet, its ninth session. We received a cordial invitation to attend.

The subject under discussion was city transport. During our tour of the city we had not gained the impression that transport was a problem. Nebit-Dag is a young city (this year it will celebrate its thirtieth birthday). It is not very large and has been built according to a definite plan. You can see all the way down its straight, incredibly clean streets to the mountains at one end or the desert at the other. The whole transport fleet consists of 300 buses and some taxis. So where's the problem? Our impression was confirmed by the opening report, which mentioned that the transport workers had been awarded a diploma by the Party Central Committee and the republic's Council of Ministers.

But perhaps our judgement was based on a knowledge of transport problems in cities far from Turkmenistan. Anyway, the Nebit-Dag people were not interested in outside standards. Their criticism was levelled against what they considered unsatisfactory in their own conditions. The deputies' investigating commission presented its report to the Soviet and this was followed by a lively debate. Obviously the deputies had a good knowledge of the system. They had studied traffic flows and talked to their constituents and the municipal authorities. The session passed a characteristic decision, giving credit where credit was due, pointing out some specific shortcomings and stating who would be responsible for rectifying them, how long he had for doing so, and who would check on the final result.

There were also several procedural points that indicated the way the Soviet tackles its duties. For instance, there was the fact that nearly all the deputies (200 out of 230) were present from beginning to end of the session. There was the sense of confidence with which they demanded answers to their questions. There was the fact that these answers, given by the city administrators, were always serious and well-reasoned. Even so, the chairman stated quite emphatically at the end of the debate, "We request the deputies' transport commission to consider once again whether the answers given at this session are satisfactory and report on this to the next session."

In the local Soviets all over Turkmenistan, we were told, 2,210 such sessions were held last year. More than half the deputies spoke and 4,500 questions were discussed. From statistics we were able to judge which problems most of the Soviets have been concentrating on. Top priority is given to agriculture, land-usage, and protection of the environment; second come planning and budgetary matters; and third, questions of public education and culture. Other subjects were checking on the observance of socialist laws and the maintenance of public order, health and social security problems, public catering and provision of everyday amenities. In fact, there is hardly a single aspect of life that does not warrant their attention.

We realised how unfounded are the claims of some "Sovietologists" that socialism leads to over-centralisation, that the local government bodies depend entirely on the centre and cannot take any decisions on the vital problems of their area. The facts we have cited here surely indicate the opposite—the local Soviets are firmly in control of both political and economic affairs in their districts. They have full powers to make practical decisions on all questions concerning the conditions of the life, work, amenities and cultural activities of the population. They have a good deal of scope for showing initiative and doing real creative work, and also the legal and material means for putting their decisions into practice.

Naturally there are clear limits to the competence of the Soviets because the interests of separate regions have to be co-ordinated with those of the country as a whole. But even in cases when the problems extend beyond the competence of a given Soviet, the Soviet is by no means helpless.

As an example, we were told of a case from the history of the Kara-Kum Canal. After covering a thousand kilometres across the hot desert, it reached Ashkhabad and spread out in a large reservoir, where the local people go sailing. But then a tricky dilemma arose.

What should be the next step? Should the digging be continued without any break along the main route and the Caspian Sea or should the builders call a temporary halt and concentrate on land reclamation along the part of the canal that had been completed? Opinions differed. The USSR Ministry of Land Reclamation and Water Resources in Moscow, for instance, was in favour of the second alternative in view of its economic advantages. Their idea was that after an advance there should be consolidation, then a further advance. And they had good grounds for their argument.

But there were other considerations as well, and in Turkmenistan they predominated. What is water? A fluid used in farming and industry? Certainly. But it is also the "moisture of life" in any broader sense. Where the canal had been built, we saw better what water means. It means tree-lined streets and the dew sung by poets, it means fishing and swimming, beaches and even life-savers, for they, too, became a necessity in Turkmenistan.

In Nebit-Dag and Qum Dagh, we saw how eagerly people were waiting for what they call the "big water". But its advance is outside the competence of the town Soviet. The canal is a national project the republic cannot build it without help. Accordingly, the Turkmen government and Supreme Soviet took the matter to Union agencies, to ministries and the central government, to the Supreme Soviet of the USSR. Speaking at its latest session, B. Burashnikov, first deputy Chairman of the Council of Ministers in Turkmenistan, described the project as one of immense significance, both economic and social. This view prevailed in the end. The tenth five-year plan provides for the continuation of work on the Kara-Kum Canal project. It will be extended by more than 200 kilometres, making the canal 1,100 km long.

There are no "gaps" between Soviets, such as could hinder discussion and solution of the complicated problems that life poses unstintingly. From top to bottom, the Soviets make up one system of government bodies. Its lower echelons vigorously support and help to carry out decisions made in higher echelons. They also work out and send in their own proposals, which the Soviets higher up carefully examine. Interaction takes place with strict respect for the sovereign rights of the Union republics and with due regard to the distinctive aspects of local conditions and to the extended rights and powers of local Soviets. The extension came when, between 1968 and 1971, new laws on village, settlement, town and district Soviets were passed in all Union and Autonomous Republics. The 25th CPSU Congress stressed that the effort must be continued by bringing the jurisdiction of the Soviets at the next level—Territory, Region and Area—into line with present-day requirements. We understand that a special commission of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR is now working on this.

The Soviets carry on their activities in the full view and with the participation of the deputies and the general public. Their links are so varied and ramified that

we admit it took us some time to form a clear picture. Indeed, the deputies are distributed among standing commissions, which have a large body of voluntary assistants (known by the collective name of *aktiv*) in the fields concerned. The Ashkhabad City Council, for example, has an *aktiv* of 1,000 people, or almost three times the number of deputies. Nor is this all. The Soviets' executive committees have a number of other voluntary organisations and committees. They include parents' committees, councils for work among women, people's public order squads, youth counsellors and committees supervising observance of legislation on religion. The whole of Turkmenistan has about 23,000 people active in organisations of this nature, and about 200,000 inhabitants belong to the *aktivs* of Soviets.

As we got to know more about the activities of the Soviets, as we talked with deputies, activists and Party leaders, we also gained an idea of the problems, the as yet unsolved difficulties that arise in the course of the practical functioning of the system of people's government in the USSR. This was only to be expected. We were studying not some Utopian system where everything was supposed to be perfect from the start and needed no further development. What we were studying was the practical participation of the masses in governing the country. Such participation implies real creativity on the part of the masses and, like any historical process, it is in a state of constant development and change. Of far greater importance, from our point of view, is the nature of these difficulties and problems. In contrast to the situation in the capitalist world they don't have to be solved by stripping down the whole political system and building it anew. The way these problems have to be tackled is through making even fuller use of the latent possibilities of the system, perfecting each part of the mechanism, which is built on principles that have proved their worth in practice. And this is exactly how the CPSU tackles them.

Furthermore, the Soviets do not operate in a vacuum. They closely interact with the biggest non-governmental organisations—Party, trade union, youth, scientific, technological, cultural and educational. While this article was in preparation some highly relevant data appeared in the Soviet press. Through the system of Soviets and public organisations, 2 million deputies and 30 million voluntary activists take part in deciding public and state affairs. But this is not all. Participating in the process there are also 9.5 million voluntary inspectors, 113 million trade union members and more than 35 million Komsomol members. This great mass of people is united by the Communist Party, which itself has a membership of 16 million. (*Pravda*, March 18, 1977). The activity of these millions of people form a living close-knit fabric of socialist democracy. When you have discovered that, you realise better than ever that Leonid Brezhnev, General Secretary of the CC CPSU, had every reason to say not long ago that in practice the whole Soviet state is administered from top to bottom with the participation of the masses.

The Commissions

From Turkmenistan our route led to Moscow and the Supreme Soviet of the USSR.

The Supreme Soviet, which consists of two chambers: the Soviet of the Union and the Soviet of Nationalities, sits twice a year and the Soviet state flag flies above the Grand Kremlin Palace during sessions. Their proceeding are widely

... were told that the Supreme Sov[illegible] ... doors. The impressive Georgi[illegible]
int[illegible] never ... Green and Red Halls are open to representatives of the [illegible]
Vladimirsky, ... There are live radio and telev[illegible]
public and to foreign diplomats and newsmen. A deputy is shown a transcript of his speech
broadcasts of the sessions. ... and the transcript is printed in the cur[illegible]
about ten minutes after delivering it, ... A full report of the proceeding is published soon after
issue of a daily bulletin.
session.

The public closely follows the sessions because they pass laws, appro[illegible] economic plans, hear reports on their fulfilment and discuss major problem[illegible]. Much less is known, especially abroad, about the activity of the Supreme Sovie[illegible] in between sessions.

The capitalist press, with its shrill propaganda campaigns against the socialist way of life, alleges, for example, that except for a few days a year, the Supreme Soviet is permanently "on holiday" and that the deputies lack "professional qualifications" because they only work, perform their parliamentary duties, from time to time.

What is meant here, by "work" and "professionalism"? Professionally, the deputies to the Supreme Soviet are workers, farmers, engineers, people active in the cultural sphere, doctors, teachers, scientists, economic managers, political leaders—in short, they represent every field of activity. But this is precisely why the Supreme Soviet deals with every problem in the presence of and with the participation of people whose experience and prestige in the given field are universally recognised. Let us see what is done in between sessions.

First of all there is the work of the standing commissions which we described briefly in our account of the local Soviets.

We do not expect the commissions and sub-commissions to be seen as a Soviet invention. These are forms used in numerous countries belonging to different social systems. But while these agencies are similar in form, they differ strikingly in content. The Library of the US Congress has published a report saying that in 1975, over half of the 138 Congress committees held only four or even fewer meetings each and 28 did not meet at all. Senator Dale Bumpers, who had asked for the report, was certainly right when he called these data a further indication of the low efficiency of Congress.

In the Soviet Union, the standing commissions have been set up "to contribute to the continuous and effective functioning of the USSR Supreme Soviet during and between sessions" as the Statute puts it. Their leverage is growing. And while all the commissions of the first Supreme Soviet comprised 89 deputies, those of the second and fifth numbered 114 and 258 respectively and now they comprise 1,000, or two-thirds of the total number of deputies.

The commissions are empowered to supervise the exercise of executive authority[4] and they make wide use of this right. The planning and budget commissions, for instance, carefully examine, together with representatives of the industrial commissions concerned, draft budgets submitted to the Supreme Soviet, as well as draft economic plans, including five-year ones. Before the latest session (October 1976), which approved the tenth five-year plan, the commissions worked on the draft for a month and the work involved 600 deputies, or more than one-third of all deputies. In addition to the draft plan, they discussed 147 reports from ministeries, departments and Union republics.

...participate directly in legislation. We were enabled to acquaint ... this activity by studying official records. As an illustration, we ... the discussion on basic legislation on underground resources, the ... the USSR Supreme Soviet's protection of the environment laws. Here ... e episodes from that discussion.

... experts sub-commission includes noted scientists, managers, lawyers, ...nomists, production organisers. We quote from the minutes:

"V. Fedanov: The previous meeting entrusted Comrades Pankratov, Zhabrev, Kaverin and myself with ascertaining whether we need a paragraph defining the state fund of underground resources as a whole. We consider it necessary. Legislation on land and water, for instance, defines not only the state fund as a whole, but also its components. We suggest that the paragraph be worded as follows (he reads the text).

"A. Sergeyev: I have been against such a paragraph from the first because it is absolutely impossible to define the state of underground resources. To talk about the 'increase' or 'expenditure' of such resources means nothing. Not so in the case of minerals. But then we risk mixing up concepts.

"I. Baigulenko: I don't think we need that paragraph.

"I. Zhabrev: Whether we like it or not, we cannot get away from defining in law what we mean by 'underground resources'. Look at what people propose—half of it is about that. It follows that we need a definition.

"L. Melnikov (chairman): I suggest that we vote. Those in favour of the paragraph, please raise your hands. Nine. Who is against? Ten. Motion rejected."

Episode two is borrowed from the debate on the same bill in a joint drafting commission of Supreme Soviet deputies.

"I. Voronin: The draft speaks of prohibiting 'unjustified selective working of rich deposits'. This is an unfortunate wording.

"V. Stepanov: 'Unjustified' should be crossed out. 'Justification' can always be found.

"I. Voronin: Last year five million tons of ore had to be written off at a mine near where I work, as a result of selective working. The law on mineral resources is meant to protect them. Leaving in a word like that could spoil everything.

"S. Ibrahimov (chairman): Any suggestions?

"N. Chersky: We should agree with Comrade Voronin.

"S. Ibrahimov: So we take out the word 'unjustified'."

However, the next meeting had to return to the amendment.

"O. Kolesov: I think we should accept the original wording. We in the Ukraine have a coal pit whose deposits are set at 100 million tons. If the amendment is approved the pit could lose a whole coal bed.

"L. Melnikov: There are many cases in which rich areas are allowed to be worked selectively. In Canada we saw huge piles of lean ore near a mine. They use ore with a one per cent copper content and there is a reserve pile with a 0.3 to 0.4 per cent metal content.

"I. Voronin: I still disagree and will raise the question at the session. . . ."[5]

The above calls for some explanation.

The Basic Legislation on Mineral Resources bill was submitted by the government and won unanimous approval. Three amendments were moved by deputies during the debate but only one was approved. Anyone who thinks this is too little should compare the texts of the law and the bill (incidentally, the bill

was published and was open to public discussion for four months). He would find identical texts in the case of only one article (Art. 50 of the law); everything else is different—there are different structural solutions, new wordings and a number of additional articles.

Perhaps the bill was not properly worded? No, its basic provisions were approved at every framing stage. This also goes for the Basic Legislation on Education, but there were 43 amendments and nine new articles, the Basic Legislation on Public Health, in which 46 of the 55 articles were amended, and the Basic Legislation on Land—three new articles were added and a number of other redrafted. That is a regular procedure: the law on underground resources was examined paragraph by paragraph, some parts even word by word, before it was put into final shape.

In the Supreme Soviet archives there are red files marked "permanent", containing thousands of typescript pages, a record of the hundreds of meetings of the standing commissions of the two chambers, the joint preparatory commission, expert subcommissions, drafting groups, ad hoc sub-groups on various problems, etc. Day after day, the Supreme Soviet receives reports from Union republics, ministeries, research centres, industrial enterprises, and analyses press comments and letters from the public. There appeared to be more than 1,500 letters.

Geological engineer A. Kostikov sent in proposals from Krivoi Rog direct to the Supreme Soviet and they were carefully considered. K. Urazayeva, an Uzbek student, wrote to the newspaper *Izvestia.* The ideas in her letter were reflected in the Law. It was probably a pleasant surprise for A. Teryayaev, chief engineer of a mine in Armenia, to read the final version of Clause 32 containing a whole paragraph exactly as he had suggested in a local newspaper.

Such cases were by no means just the lucky ones. We could mention many more. Anything that was practical and worthwhile was accepted; only the unworkable was rejected.

There is a debate at every framing stage. We have mentioned the case of the experts subcommission rejecting, by a majority of one, a proposed amendment to the underground resources bill. But the amendment was accepted just the same—the deputies overruled the experts. I. Voronin, director of the Ust-Kemenogorsk lead and zinc combine, did not have to speak at a Supreme Soviet session (as he had said he would at the concluding meeting of the preparatory commission) about the word "unjustified", because his view had prevailed in the meantime.

What we find really interesting is certainly not the allegations of certain authors who say there is "no free exchange of views" in the Supreme Soviet, but something entirely different. Why do such debates persist? What causes them? In a socialist society there are no antagonistic contradictions or hostile classes and groups, no clash, as under capitalism, between the people's interest in thrifty utilisation of the country's mineral wealth and its wasteful exploitation by monopoly. Why, then, all the argument over a single word?

L. Melnikov, Chairman of the experts subcommission, had an interesting answer. He is a veteran of seven terms in the Supreme Soviet and a veteran, also, of many of its debates. He said he did not always get his view accepted—after all, no set of arguments is so strong it cannot be corrected and improved by another.

This, like the earlier case of elections, shows that the urge to achieve unanimity

is an essential feature of socialist democracy, a qualitatively new feature that distinguishes it from capitalist democracy. Some Western commentators seek "glimpses of freedom" under socialism only in opposing voices, if only just one deputy would disagree with something, they say.

We have an instance of this. Just before the Basic Legislation on the Family and Matrimony was put to the vote in the Supreme Soviet, V. I. Simukonene, a Lithuanian deputy (a teacher), unexpectedly moved four amendments. Nothing could have been easier than just to hear the amendments and go straight ahead with the vote. The majority was in favour of the bill and it was certain to be approved. But what about those few lost votes—how much they would mean to the apostles of "freedom" by registering an "opposition"?

The session chose a different approach that also required greater effort. The vote was put off for 24 hours and the commission concerned weighed the proposed amendments on their merits regardless of the fact that they came from one deputy. The commission recommended that two of the amendments be included in the all-Union law and the other two, which were of a more particular nature, be referred to the Union republics. So unanimity prevailed once again, and it is a more popular law because of it.

We see a key achievement and advantage of socialist democracy in the fact that the political system of Soviet society allows to achieve unanimity which encompasses all opinions, even those backed by the few, and that a mechanism has been devised that enables people to come to terms without pushing anybody aside as "opposition".

The Presidium

In the three hours we spent with M. P. Georgadze, Secretary of the Presidium, Supreme Soviet of the USSR, the Kremlin changed its appearance three times. In the morning, its golden domes thrust into a limpid spring sky, then we saw curly summer clouds floating in the blue, and lastly a snowstorm swept across the city. We wondered what the Kremlin had looked like when our interlocutor first came to Moscow. M. Georgadze has been a member of the Presidium for twenty years now. As a young man he was a tractor-driver in the Caucasus and when he first came to Moscow with some of his countrymen they went straight to the Red Square to see the Kremlin. "We even took a taxi for the purpose. And then we saw it. I'd never have thought I was going to work there some day."

In the Soviet Union the state is headed by a collective body, the Supreme Soviet of the USSR. Its numerical composition is stipulated by the Constitution and guarantees representation of all the Union republics and main population groups. The Presidents of the Supreme Soviet Presidiums of the Union republics are elected by tradition to be Vice-Presidents of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet. The present membership includes L. I. Brezhnev, General Secretary of the CC CPSU; V. V. Nikolayeva-Tereshkova, the first woman cosmonaut; N. A. Novosyolova, a milling-machine operator at the Urals motor works; Rasul Gamzatov, the Daghestan poet; Academician I. I. Artobolevsky, and A. V. Gitalov, a collective-farm team leader from the Ukraine.

The Presidium is elected by and from deputies to the Supreme Soviet, to which it is accountable. The Constitution chapter on the highest government bodies describes the Presidium as a component of the Supreme Soviet and an agency ensuring the latter's continuous functioning.

In the Presidium room, around the conference table, there are chairs for 36 members of the Presidium. One of them is for Nikolai Podgorny, President of the Presidium, and along both sides of the room there are seats for invited members of the public. Most of their meetings are held in open session.

"The last session," Georgadze told us, "was held only two days ago. You may have read about it in the papers. We were discussing problems of the procedure for dealing with letters sent to state organisations by members of the public. On another point in the agenda proposals were made for amending existing legislation. The Presidium also discussed the question of drafting the fundamentals of forestry legislation, and passed a decision to publish the draft for public discussion and put it before the next session of the Supreme Soviet. And as part of our usual practice we heard and discussed reports on the work of two standing commissions of deputies.

Between sessions, the Presidium takes decisions on important administrative, economic, social, cultural and foreign policy matters. It sets the dates of elections to the Supreme Soviet, convenes regular sessions, coordinates the work of the two chambers and standing commissions, keeps in touch with the deputies and supervises execution of the Acts approved by the Supreme Soviet. It assigns an important place to steps aimed at promoting socialist legality and protecting citizens' rights. Its prerogatives include the awarding of orders, medals and honourary titles.

Presidium meetings concern themselves with key problems. As for everyday matters, these are settled by polling the Presidium members. Each Presidium member has two weeks to study the documents and hold the requisite consultations, and then he must give his opinion—pro or con—in writing. A document is approved only when all Presidium members agree; when there are objections the matter is referred to a meeting. And there is a hot line for deciding urgent matters.

M. Georgadze informed us in detail about the everyday work of the Presidium. We had no difficulty in discerning standards designed to maintain democracy in collective decision-making and ensure that decisions are adopted unanimously.

In conclusion, we were interested to hear about the relationship and interaction between the Soviets and the Communist Party, between Party organisations and deputies.

"Our Party does much to advance socialist democracy and perfect the functioning of Soviets", the Presidium Secretary told us. "The 25th Party Congress made an important contribution in this respect. In drafting the new Soviet Constitution we follow the strategy evolved by the Congress. Congress recommendations are at the basis of our work on a code of laws and on a new Statute of Territory, Region and Area Soviets.

"Being an ideological and political force of society, the Party influences the work of Soviets accordingly, and not by issuing 'instructions' or interfering. Local Soviets get constant attention and help from the Party organisations. Communists collectively discuss such matters of fundamental importance to the work of Soviets as Leninist working methods, full exercise of rights and powers, control over the execution of decisions, more efficient work by the deputies. The Party group of a Soviet is generally led by the first secretary of the Party committee of the district, city, region or republic concerned. According to tradition, Communist deputies render account to their constituencies and fellow-Communists."

On our way from the Kremlin, we felt that we had investigated all essential components of the USSR's governmental system. We had satisfied ourselves that workers and peasants hold the majority of seats and have a decisive say in government bodies. We realise, of course, that to be elected to the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the country is an honour that is not granted to many. However, all elected government bodies, which make one system, function according to one and the same set of laws. Those who take part in their activities know by experience and see in their everyday lives that the purpose of these activities is the people's well-being.

* * *

Democracy is passing through a deep crisis in the countries where the Communist parties we represent are operating, that is, in the capitalist part of the world. Political struggles in bourgeois conditions reveal the tremendous effort which has to be made to safeguard democratic rights and freedoms, the high cost of every legislative office and the numerous obstacles to a people's representative winning office. The capitalist press more and more often admits such realities as the people's dwindling confidence, the limited role of elected bodies, the curtailment of legislative functions in favour of executive authority. These alarming signs are growing.

What we have seen in our study of the Soviets indicates that the future of democracy lies in the transfer of power to the working people, in the transition to socialism. This happened for the first time 60 years ago. The Soviets, have travelled a long way since then, they have developed and now they show their strength. Their activity fully confirms Lenin's definition of what the Soviets stand for: "It was an authority open to all, it carried out all its functions before the eyes of the masses, and was a direct and immediate instrument of the popular masses, of their will" (*Coll. Works*, Vol. 10, p. 245). The system of people's rule confidently follows its own traditions and development laws. It has gained invaluable experience, the results and advantages of which are available to all.

---

[1] Legislation on Elections to the Supreme Soviet of the Turkmen Soviet Socialist Republic, Ashkhabad, 1975, p. 36.

[2] The local Soviets in Turkmenistan are composed of 21,118 deputies. Of them, 68.2 per cent are workers and collective farmers; 77.5 per cent are Turkmen; 43 per cent are candidate members or members of the CPSU; 44.8 per cent are women (among them 73 per cent are Turkmen women); 32.4 per cent are young people under 30.

[3] "Law On the Status of Deputies of the Soviet of Working People's Deputies in the USSR". Article 6.

[4] "The standing commissions of the Soviet of the Union and the Soviet of Nationalities shall be entitled to hear reports on matters under their jurisdiction by representatives of the Government of the USSR, ministries, USSR departments and other all-Union agencies, as well as by representatives of republican and local government bodies and organisations." When asked by a commission, leaders of any rank "shall appear at commission meetings to testify on the matters under discussion". "The recommendations of a standing commission shall be considered by government agencies and organisations without fail. The results of the consideration or the measures adopted shall be communicated to the commission within two months at the latest." (Statute of the Standing Commission of the Soviet of the Union and Soviet of Nationalities of the USSR, Moscow, 1974, Art. 21 and 23).

[5] "A standing commission member whose proposals have failed to win the support of the commission may uphold them during the discussion of the relevant item by the Supreme Soviet of the USSR or its Presidium" (Statute of the Standing Commissions of the Soviet of the Union and the Soviet of Nationalities of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR, Art. 26).

The Illusions of Bourgeois Reformism in Developing Countri

IRADJ ESKANDARI

First Secretary, Central Committee, People's Party of Iran

THE immediate aim of every anti-colonial revolution and of every nationa liberation movement—irrespective of the methods it has chosen and of tl development stage of the embattled people—is the winning of nation sovereignty, i.e., wresting political power from the imperialists. But the winnir of political power does not cover the entire concept of national independence. no less important aspect is economic emancipation, i.e., using all the natur resources and productive forces to benefit the people, not foreign capital. Th both these aspects of national independence (the political and the economic) a inseparable, is widely recognised in developing countries. For in this day and ag political imperialist domination is exercised mainly through neocoloniali economic penetration.

In many liberated countries state sovereignty has not prevented imperiali neocolonialist exploitation of a large, in some cases the main, part of the natural and manpower resources. For the developed capitalist countries the former colonies and semi-colonies are still a source of cheap mineral an agricultural raw materials. Up to 60-80 per cent of the exports of many Afr Asian and Latin American countries consist of two or three products, in son cases even one. Their economic development is dependent on the capitali market and subject to its fluctuations and laws, which seriously impede, if n altogether block, efforts to overcome backwardness. How this works can be see in the price changes in trade between developed capitalist and developir countries, which more often than not, are to the disadvantage of the latter.[1]

That is why the wide economic-level gap is becoming wider still. In 1953 tl ratio between average per-capita income was 1:8, in 1973 it was 1:16. Tl developing countries account for about 15 per cent of the capitalist world output and for no more than 18 per cent of its foreign trade. Their constant increasing indebtedness to the capitalist West, which now stands at $160-17 billion, and their foreign trade deficit (with the exception of the oil-exportin countries) added up to more than $51 billion in 1975. The multination monopolies are draining out huge sums from the developing countries—n profits in 1973-75 were in excess of $23 billion.

The social results of imperialist exploitation are even more staggering. Tl World Bank estimates that more than 800 million in Asia, Africa and Lati America live in abject poverty, and according to the International Labou Bureau, in 1975 there were 280 million unemployed, or about 30 per cent of tl able-bodied population.

We Marxists are convinced that economic emancipation is inconceivabl without fundamental internal change to remove the main obstacles to expansio of the productive forces and thus create the groundwork for all-roun development of the national economy and narrow the gap between developin and developed industrial countries. However, these much-needed chang

encounter resistance from imperialism and from the conservative forces at home. The choice of the capitalist or the socialist path is determined by the balance of strength between these forces and those working for genuine social, economic and political progress. And though the struggle is far from complete in many of the emergent states, more and more of them are opting for the socialist orientation. It is only logical that imperialism, with a vital interest in hardening their social and economic backwardness and dependence, should do everything it can to contain or reverse the trend.

The international situation today is such that the imperialist powers cannot, as easily as in the past, use outright coercion to keep developing countries within their orbit. This is why along with neocolonialist methods of economic penetration, they rely on the "export" of reactionary economic, political and social concepts based on the supposed "benefits" of capitalism, its growth potential, "free enterprise", "consumer society", etc. And this goes hand in hand with intensive anti-communist propaganda, the spread of all manner of lies about the economic and social position in the socialist countries, flagrant anti-Soviet slander, biased interpretation of developments in the international workers' and national-liberation movement.

Reformism is a key ideological weapon in these attempts to prevent the developing countries from choosing the correct path. The bourgeoisie, it will be recalled, brought reformism into the labour movement of the capitalist countries to emasculate its revolutionary content and "reconcile" it with capitalism. Now the imperialists are systematically using it also in the developing countries, where the working-class movement is very young, in some cases still in the embryonic stage. The main purpose of reformism here is not so much to prevent, or even soft-pedal, the development of working-class political activity (though that aim is also pursued), as to compel the national-liberation movement to abandon its revolutionary anti-imperialist course in favour of "co-operation" with imperialism and accept the capitalist orientation.

This "adaptation" of reformism to the national-liberation movement is not new, of course. More than half a century ago, Lenin pointed to the difference between reformist and revolutionary trends in colonial and dependent countries. And this difference, he said in his report to the Second Congress of the Communist International in 1920, "has been very clearly revealed of late in the backward and colonial countries, since the imperialist bourgeoisie is doing everything in its power to implant the reformist movement among the oppressed nations too" (*Coll. Works*, Vol. 31, p. 242).

Of course, the collapse of the colonial system compelled the imperialists to make the necessary alterations in the methods of disseminating reformist ideas in the newly-liberated countries. In the past, the main method was direct use of colonial power and the organisations that serve it. Now the imperialists have to operate through "middlemen". And they are of different kinds.

Where anti-democratic and anti-national governments have been installed as a result of direct imperialist intervention or support, the machinery of government sometimes serves as the conduit of reformist conceptions. In such cases the state employs a system of harsh repressions against the revolutionary elements in the national-liberation movement, combined with certain economic and social reforms to promote capitalist production relations. The reactionary concept of alliance between the exploiter and exploited classes is assiduously inculcated,

partly through demagogic propaganda to create the illusion that econo
emancipation can be achieved through bourgeois reforms and industrialisat
based on co-operation, even merger, with foreign monopoly capital. In this a
other ways the ruling faction tries to prove the "advantages" of the capitalist o
the socialist orientation.

There are many opportunities for instilling reformist conceptions in
national-liberation movement in countries where the national government ta
a more or less conciliatory and inconsistent attitude vis-a-vis imperialism. A
of course, imperialism makes the maximum use of its natural ally,
reactionary sections of society and their political organisations.

Historically, the capitalist mode of production represents a degree of progr
over precapitalist formations, and reforms that accelerate the introduction
capitalist production relations make the economy more dynamic. Some politi
leaders and ideologists describe this as a progressive process. In particular, tl
draw an analogy between 19th century reforms in Germany and present-
reforms in, say, Iran. But any such comparison ignores the following import
factors.

First, a "revolution from the top", whether in Iran or any other develop
country, cannot be equated with the 19th century reforms carried out by Pruss
methods, for the simple reason that we are at the imperialist stage of wo
capitalism, at the state-monopoly and not preimperialist stage, when
monopolies were not yet holding back the dynamism of "free competition"
other words, when capitalism was still in its ascendance.

Second, bourgeois reformist measures carried out against the backgroun
capitalism's general crisis can only lead to dependent economic developm
and, at best, raise the country to the status of a capitalist country subjec
imperialism. The experience of the past 30 years has made it perfectly clear
development along capitalist lines means that economic and, consequently,
political dependence are not reduced, but in many cases actually increased
result of a reformist policy and a conciliatory, if not to say encouraging, atti
to the neocolonialist activities of the imperialist monopolies.

Third, in this time of transition from capitalism to socialism on a world s
such development, though it does to a certain extent alleviate backwardne
nevertheless historical regress compared with the perspectives open to
developing countries with the existence and strength of the socialist world sy
and its all-round and effective support of the young states.

Fourth, economic development in Asia, Africa and Latin America shoul
be measured against the more or less archaic system of the past. The aim sh
be to choose a path which, in a relatively short time, would enable the
overcome their backwardness compared with the developed industrial coun
so that the hundreds of millions whom imperialism assigned a minor ro
history would be brought into the mainstream of progress.

All this can be attained through fundamental socio-economic changes a
at the subsequent building of socialism, of a society free of exploitation.
presupposes, in particular, a bigger organisational role for the nati
democratic state, primarily in establishing a powerful public economic sect
vital to victory in the fight for national liberation. Only in that way will the r
of the first stage of the national-liberation struggle (the winning of po
power) serve as a firm foundation for victory in the second stage, i.e., eco

emancipation, which is the decisive factor in consolidating political independence.

The imperialists are bent on preventing the developing countries from choosing the socialist orientation. And to that end they are turning some of these countries into showcases of capitalist development which, they affirm, will bring the peoples economic prosperity and social progress. Iran is being held up as the most convincing example. Hence, even a cursory examination of Iran's development over the past 20 years is highly instructive.

The pro-imperialist regime established through a coup in August 1953 proceeded to introduce capitalist relations by authoritarian methods, calling the series of measures adopted to this end a "white revolution" and later a "*revolution of the shah and the people*". *It promised to achieve economic* progress, raise the standard of living, consolidate national independence, "restore Iran's one-time greatness", and so on.[2] Through this "revolution", Iranian society was to have taken a leap enabling it not only to end its lag in a record time but to become, in the shah's words, one of "the world's five major industrial powers" in 10 to 20 years. But while 20 years of a markedly capitalist orientation have passed, Iran's social and economic reality is entirely different from what was promised.

There is no denying that the rapid introduction of capitalist production relations by effecting certain bourgeois reforms, in particular an agrarian reform, as well as through more or less guided industrial construction, imparted a degree of dynamism to the country's stagnant semi-feudal economy. From 1968 to 1973, GNP increased by 107 per cent. But behind this impressive figure there is the reality of uneven development by industries. While the annual growth of industrial output in that period was 15 per cent, agriculture showed a mere 2.5 per cent increase. The overall growth of GNP was due in considerable measure to a rapid increase in oil production, trade and the service industry. The changes that did take place in Iran's backward economic structure can hardly be described as far-reaching. Agriculture and the extractive industries (oil and mining) in 1972/1973 accounted for approximately 45 per cent of GNP[3], manufacturing for less than 11 per cent and the service industry, whose over-expansion is typical of the economy of the underdeveloped countries, 40 per cent.

Much of the output of the manufacturing industry comes from the food and textile industries (31 and 27 per cent, respectively). The petrochemical, chemical, steel, metalworking, mechanical engineering and other heavy industries, which are the main factor for economic progress, supply only about 20 per cent of total industrial output.[4] More and more capital goods have to be imported (they claim over a quarter of all investments). This suggests that economic growth is unreliable and depends entirely on the capitalist market. Besides, the metalworking, electrical engineering and some other industries still include numerous primitive enterprises using chiefly manual labour.

Industrial imbalances are compounded by the uneven geographical distribution of industrial investments, which are concentrated in Teheran, Ahwaz, Isfahan, Arak and Tabriz. As for vast areas in the east, south-east and south of the country and in the border areas—Kurdistan, Iranian Azerbaijan and Western Khousistan—they are allotted only a small part of the investments and their development rate is still very low.

The lag of rural Iran, where 18 million out of a total population of 34 million

live, is increasing. Official policy, aimed at mechanising work on capitalist farms has virtually sacrificed the small peasants to big capital, which often merges with foreign monopoly capital. These farms (some of them with more than 100,000 hectares and assets of $100 million) were given the finest lands and every manner of technical and financial aid. All the other farms continue to use much the same primitive techniques as they did before the 1961 reform, with the wooden plough still the principal implement. These three million farms owned by individual peasants (over 10 million people) were left to their devices after the abolition of the semi-feudal system of land tenure and are suffering from decreasing crop yields and output and a declining standard of life. Until recently an exporter of farm produce, Iran is now compelled to import millions of tons of grain and large quantities of meat, dairy products and even fruit.

The country's economic growth as a whole is based exclusively on the revenue from oil. And since oil sales have been under effective foreign monopoly control in spite of the agreement with the International Petroleum Cartel signed in March 1973, Iran is developing lopsidedly and, moreover, finds itself dependent on the oil monopolies' "goodwill". This policy runs counter to the national interest, particularly as oil reserves will begin to run out within about 10 years from now.

The present regime of Iran is seen by the shah himself as "one of the most loyal friends" of the United States and the capitalist system as a whole. He has taken Iran into aggressive imperialist blocs and spends huge sums for military purposes in the interests of the policy of aggression pursued by imperialism and by arms manufacturers.[5] To bolster the balance of payments of major capitalist countries, he has "recycled" a substantial part of oil earnings (about $10,000 million) by granting loans, specifically to the World Bank and IMF, purchasing World Bank bonds and industrial shares on the Western market and in other ways.

This policy of exporting capital has greatly increased Iran's involvement in the capitalist world economy and given rise to an unprecedented reverse flow of foreign monopoly investments, attracted by the opportunity to make petro-dollars. Increased many times over since 1973, these investments are channelled either independently or in association with Iranian private and, above all, state capital into the oil, petro-chemical, steel, power, and mining industries, mechanical engineering, agriculture, the banks, construction, hotels and other businesses.

This interpenetration of foreign and domestic capital results, among other things, in growing monopoly trends among Iran's industrialists, big merchants and financiers. There emerge major government, private or mixed amalgamations that dominate whole industries fully or partly, such as automobiles (Iran National) or steel (Shahryar). Industrial capital merges more and more with bank capital. The Industrial and Mining Development Bank of Iran (assets, 7,000 million rials, or $10 million), the Shahryar Bank (5,000 million rials) and other banks are virtually controlled by major Iranian industrialists and by monopoly corporations.

The monarchic regime stimulates the formation of state monopoly capitalism in Iran by setting up infrastructure facilities and putting them at the disposal of the private sector gratis or on easy terms, granting private enterprises subsidies and loans and various tax and financial easements, undertaking to train scientiests, technical personnel and skilled workers for them and increasingly

merging government capital with domestic or foreign monopoly capital. Contradictory as this phenomenon may appear in a backward country, it is, nevertheless, an inevitable consequence of capitalist development at this imperialist stage.

While creating a monopoly upper stratum of society, the regime's economic policy leads at the other pole to a deteriorating standard of life. The capitalist agrarian reform has accelerated the impoverishment and proletarianisation of a large body of peasants and caused large-scale migration to the cities. Yet the industries cannot absorb so vast a work force and the result is mass unemployment. The "revolution of the shah and the people" has made social inequality more marked than ever, a fact admitted even officially. And while the authorities have repeatedly declared that they intend to follow an "equitable incomes policy", their actual policy is the exact opposite.

Official sources set per capita income at $1,521 a year. But the figure should be taken very critically. It is obtained by methods that are useless for establishing the real state of affairs, such as dividing the enormous oil revenue (to the tune of $17,000 million) by the total number of the population or by lumping together the incomes of the wealthy inhabitants of Teheran and other cities and the incomes of millions of peasants and workers. If that part of the oil earning which is not spent on national industrial development and consequently has no effect on the standard of living is discounted, the real per capita GNP turns out to be only $760. To be sure, the "revolution of the shah and the people" has benefited some highly privileged categories supported by the regime—the big merchants and manufacturers as well as top civil servants and military men—and has been of some help to the middle strata, but the vast majority of the population has gained nothing.

Contrary to official allegations, the plight of the people and the increasingly uneven economic development are not a product of passing difficulties "arising naturally from an ever more prosperous economy". Iran's current economic and social difficulties are due mostly to structural causes and are a direct consequence of the regime's policy. The "Iranian miracle", far from delivering the country from economic dependence, has extended this dependence to every sphere of public life. More than before, the economy depends on the capitalist market for industrial plant and raw materials as well as for food—a fact unprecedented in the country's history. More than 20 years of forced capitalist development have, in spite of the existence of immense financial resources, revealed the adverse results of an orientation entirely at variance with the people's vital interests.

The capitalist orientation runs counter by its very nature to the fundamental objectives of the national liberation movement, for it inevitably ties the developing countries to the imperialist economic system. This means that the main obstacles to social and economic progress and the dependence of key economic fields on the capitalist market and imperialist monopoly are still there.

Attempts to "integrate" the developing countries into the monopoly capitalist system inevitably come up against the fundamental contradiction between the people's desire for independence and the imperialists' neocolonial policy. The peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America are increasingly aware that they cannot win economic freedom through capitalist development, which makes it a mirage in the desert of imperialist subjugation.

The West says many nice things about "development aid", "international

economic co-operation", "releasing funds to maintain the purchasing capacity of countries producing raw materials", and so on. The facts show, however, that the imperialist powers are by no means eager to foster the social and economic progress of these countries but want to retain their own privileges at all costs. A fairly recent indication of this was the virtual failure of the international economic co-operation conference (Paris, December 1975) of 19 developing countries and major capitalist countries to devise "better" forms of mutual economic relations.

It should be noted at this point that the neocolonial policy of imperialism is obviously becoming more and more international as a component of the counter-revolutionary global strategy of an old world trying to check the inexorable march of history. Although their mutual contradictions persist, the imperialist powers want to maintain and "collectively" affirm their domination both in countries which they have contrived to bring into their aggressive blocs and the non-aligned countries (through the European Common Market, for instance). In this situation, the global strategy of imperialism towards the developing countries includes not only economic neocolonialism but the imposition of anti-democratic governments, the export of diverse forms of fascism and the use of every means of direct or indirect pressure, intimidation, blackmail and violence.

US imperialism is the biggest "exporter" of fascist-like regimes. Reactionary dictatorships are in power in all those countries of the Middle East, Southeast Asia, Africa and Latin America where US influence predominates. The stranglehold of US monopolies is strongest in Latin America, where 80 per cent of the population live under dictatorial regimes, including fascist regimes, as in Chile.

According to a report published by the Brookings Institute in December 1976, the US government since 1945 has interfered not less than 215 times in the affairs of developing countries by threatening them with military force or actually using it. Washington's recent attempts (backed by all Western powers) to frighten the OPEC countries into renouncing the oil price increase on which they had agreed at the Duha conference (December 1976) were so obvious that even the capitalist press could not conceal the fact.

The imperialists do their best to prevent Asian, African and Latin American countries from consolidating their sovereignty and safeguarding their right to manage their natural resources as they think fit. They try to hamper co-operation between these countries in resisting plunder by the multinationals. Now a primary requisite of economic liberation is uncompromising struggle to dislodge foreign monopoly capital from its positions.

This struggle must, of course, go hand in hand with the political struggle against imperialism and reaction at national and international level. In this connection, mention is sometimes made of the need to establish a new international political order. We believe that the issue of genuine equality in international relations cannot be reduced to a political accord reached by governments and imposed from above. It is primarily a social issue linked with the existence of two opposed social systems. For as long as imperialism exists, the economic and political basis for its exploitation of and discrimination against lagging nations will persist. The problem as posed by the progressive forces of the developing countries is to undermine the basis of this exploitation and discrimination by expanding the truly equitable and mutually beneficial

relations that have formed between them and the socialist countries.

It is the anti-imperialist trend that objectively determines the content of the struggle to reshape international economic relations on democratic and equitable lines. Anyone approaching the matter soberly and without bias cannot afford to forget this fact. The struggle of Asian, African and Latin American countries is appreciated and firmly supported by the socialist countries. And when we see deliberate or inadvertent, open or veiled attempts to divide the world into "poor" and "rich" and to lump capitalist and socialist countries together in the latter category, we say that such attempts are directed, in effect, against the developing countries, because they make it easier for the imperialists to continue and step up neocolonial exploitation.

However, the peoples of these countries realise more and more that to bring about genuine national renaissance and achieve all-round social progress, they must deepen the revolutionary anti-imperialist and anti-capitalist content of their liberation struggle and carry out fundamental changes that clear the way for advance in a socialist direction.

---

[1] Oil is no exception. Oil prices rose by only 10 per cent in the past three years, while prices of goods and services imported by OPEC countries rose by 20 per cent, which means that the "purchasing capacity" of oil has been cut by at least half.

[2] See Hamid Safari, "The 'White Revolution': Myth and Reality", in: *WMR*, September 1976.

[3] By the end of the fifth five-year plan (1978), the share of oil alone in GNP is expected to be 48.7 per cent. The one-commodity character of production is thus becoming more pronounced.

[4] Most of this 20 per cent comes from enterprises built with the aid of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries.

[5] Nearly $10,000 million has been spent on arms purchases in recent years.

The Socialist Economic Intensification Strategy

GÜNTER MITTAG

Political Bureau member and CC Secretary, Socialist Unity Party of Germany

THE whole meaning of socialism is to give people a better life, and building a developed socialist society shows us just how close the link is between that better life and economic intensification. So the SUPG bases its development strategy on unity of economic and social policy.

The Aim of Intensification

Our Party's General Secretary, Erich Honecker, emphasised in his report to the 9th Party Congress: "In future, too, our policy will be focused on consistent accomplishment of our main task, continuous improvement of the people's material and cultural standards through high growth rates, higher efficiency, scientific and technological progres and higher labour productivity. This fully accords with the interests of our people and is backed by our accumulated experience, which indicates that good work always yields good results. Higher

efficiency standards in social production provide the prerequisites for further uninterrupted accomplishment of our major social-policy undertakings. These two aspects are inseparable, for the point and purpose of socialism is to assure the well-being of the people."

Such is our Party's long-range policy, and it corresponds with the objective requirements of building developed socialist society. It has been consistently carried out since the 8th SUPG Congress (1971), which approved a wide-ranging social-policy programme centered on raising material and cultural standards. And our citizens are already enjoying its tangible results. The decisions of the 9th SUPG Congress re-emphasised our Party's determination to go ahead with far-reaching social-policy measures needed to attain our chief goal.

With the previous five-year plan successfully fulfilled, and the scientifically calculated assignments for the 1976-80 plan drawn up, we set concrete target figures for the ten-year period (1971-80), which will see truly historic changes in the German Democratic Republic.

Here are some of those figures: 1,360,000 flats will be added to our housing fund, which will mean better living conditions for more than 4 million of our citizens. About one million of these flats will be in new buildings accommodating approximately 2,800,000, or nearly a sixth of the Republic's population. About 95 per cent of them will have either central or other modern heating systems. There will be many improvements also in existing housing. In short, in these 10 years we shall have taken a long step towards final solution of the housing problem by 1990.

Real per-capita incomes will rise from the 1970 average of 5,836 marks to 9,580 in 1980, or by 65 per cent, a nearly two-thirds increase. Retail trade will increase by 100 billion marks: from 3,900 marks average per capita purchases in 1970 is about 5,800 in 1980, an increase of 50 per cent with retail prices remaining stable.

In the 1971-80 decade we shall add 33,400 new classrooms, so that about one million pupils will be attending modern schools equipped with all the latest teaching aids. The health services will be substantially expanded. Day-nursery accommodation will increase by nearly 100,000, which will be of tremendous help to working women.

All this can, and will, be achieved through dynamic economic growth. Under the current five-year plan, national income will rise to about 830 billion marks, or 200 billion above the previous five years. Economic growth is not an aim in itself, but a necessary precondition, a lever, for solving social-policy problems.

Industrial output in 1976-80 will total 1,400 billion marks, an increase of 400 billion over the previous five-year period. Investments to increase the Republic's economic potential and expand the economy's material and technical base will exceed the sum of 240 billion marks, or as much as we invested in the 17 years 1951-1967. The figures are a gauge of how the material and technical basis of socialism is being strengthened to accelerate attainment of our socialist production goals.

The immediate and priority aim of production in developed socialist society is higher material and cultural standards, and higher growth rates on the basis of intensified production is the way of achieving them. This direct interdependence of economic development and better conditions for the people is intrinsic only to socialism. In turn, higher prosperity standards become a factor in boosting production and raising its efficiency and quality. Our workers, and the people

generally, are more closely united with our socialist state and our Party. The GDR is thus consistently and perseveringly, thanks to its dynamic development, helping to strengthen socialism internationally.

Unity of economic and social policy rests on the objective basis of public ownership of the means of production and the power of the working class in alliance with the co-operative farmers, the socialist intelligentsia and other strata. And our experience has made it abundantly clear that public ownership, socialist economic planning and socialist democracy are essential factors in enabling the people directly to enjoy the fruits of their dedicated labour.

In a socialist society, in accordance with the objective economic laws that govern its development, every worker has a vital stake in making optimal use of public property in the interests of all. This determines the social basis of our people's activity, their wide participation in the socialist emulation movement for higher productivity, intensification of production, higher quality standards, more efficient use of machines and materials. Fixed production assets in 1975 amounted to 366.7 billion marks. This vast national wealth is entrusted to the 6,430,000 men and women engaged in the production sphere. That is why we regard intensification not as a purely economic problem, but rather as a social requirement stemming from the deeply humanistic nature of our society. That is our understanding of intensification, and it coincides with the Party's policy of promoting the people's well-being. Intensification is thus an inseparable part of our long-range strategy for attaining the main goal of socialism, and it is only in this context that its social implications can be fully understood.

The idea is to intensify the whole process of extended reproduction, to increase its effectiveness. Of tremendous importance in this context is the activity of the people themselves, which makes for more efficient use of machinery and materials and raises the effectiveness of all the factors that go into extended socialist reproduction. In short, the object of intensification is more rational use of all the means and resources of the socialist economy in extended reproduction. Referring to extended reproduction based on accumulation, Marx emphasised that it was not merely a matter of quantitative growth, for "at a certain point the process finds its qualitative expression in the greater productivity of the efforts needed for reproduction".

Fundamentally, intensification means higher effectiveness and higher quality in every branch of the economy. But it also means higher output, which, too, is an inalienable feature of socialism. Thus, in 1980 industrial output will be up 36 to 38 per cent on 1976, well in keeping with the growth rate in the previous five-year period. Similar growth rates are retained in the current five-year plan and this fully accords with the directives approved by the 9th Party Congress. But to assure uninterrupted growth we shall have to rely more on intensification, i.e., on qualitative factors. This is one of the regular features of our development, which has now emerged in many socialist countries.

A vivid expression of this is the increasing share of machinery and equipment in the production process. Thus, in 1960 the value of machinery per industrial worker was 34,350 marks, in 1970 the figure was 58,632 and in 1975, 74,451 marks. In other words, the value of plant per worker more than doubled in 15 years. Consumption of materials and production services in industry over the same period increased by 138 per cent, or more than doubled, though the number of workers employed rose by only 10 per cent.

Machinery is, of course, a product of social labour and its increasing use raises the effectiveness of social labour and, consequently, economic growth.

Increased effectiveness does not come automatically, it requires systematic effort. It is in this sense that Marx emphasised that labour, in conditions in which it is really free, acquires a scientific character and "expresses itself as a type of activity governing all the forces of nature".

Socialist intensification and creative labour are two sides of one and the same medal. Intensification under socialism has nothing in common with exertion of physical effort. On the contrary, it presupposes the further emancipation of labour, increases its creative nature. This is facilitated by use of the latest achievements of science and technology, and the many socialist rationalisation measures. Again the figures: In 1965, 566,000 workers submitted innovation proposals. In 1970 the figure had risen to 661,000 and in 1976 to 1,600,000. The number of production innovators has increased by one million—a result of the Party's policy of attaining our main goal through intensification. In 1975, 31 per cent of all employed in the economy had a share in innovations, and most of them, more than a million people, are directly engaged in production. This is still another indicator of social development.

Another important factor is the higher skill of our workers. In 1970-75, the number of persons with higher or special secondary education increased from 716,000 to 1,019,000, and in this period 920,000 apprentices completed their training and were assigned skilled jobs. Thus, in 1975 this category accounted for 61.7 per cent of all industrial workers as against 36 per cent in 1961. The process also has its social aspects: 75 per cent of our population up to the age of 35 now have a higher, general or specialised secondary education or have received occupational training.

All these intensification measures are attended by measures to improve working and general conditions. This applies, first and foremost, to elimination of hard manual labour, reducing industrial noise, dust and dirt resulting from technological processes, and also better planning of shops, restrooms, canteens, and also recreation, cultural and sports facilities. All-round improvement of working and general conditions is a priority aim of Party policy.

Production rationalisation under socialism is always in the interests of the people, always a means of raising their material and cultural levels and improving working and general conditions. This is one of the fundamental differences, a difference objectively determined by the character of the social system, between intensification under socialism and capitalism.

Key Problems

To achieve a steady, dynamic and well balanced development of all branches of the economy the energy and raw materials base will have to be expanded, and better use made of home stocks of raw materials. With continued expansion in the extractive industries, the economy will be assured of growing supply of materials for extended reproduction. The building up and modernising of this base is a key factor at the present stage of development of the productive forces with its long-range perspective of transition to communism. "The raising of the productivity of labour," Lenin wrote, when setting out the tasks of the Soviet government, "first of all requires that the material basis of large-scale industry shall be assured, namely, the development of the production of fuel, iron, the

engineering and chemical industries" (*Coll. Works*, Vol. 27, p. 257).

Between 1976 and 1980 approximately one-third of all the GDR's investments in the economy will go towards building up the power and raw materials base. Coal, electricity, ore, metallurgy, chemicals, construction materials and other branches of industry will be further developed. Moreover, the policy of intensification demands a comprehensive approach to the problem, involving not merely the producers of raw materials, but all branches of the economy. Maximum use must be made of every ton of raw material. Marx said that we must "turn all nature to our purposes so as to discover the new useful properties of things." Thorough and economical use of the materials we have at our disposal is our main reserve. This means all-round exploitation of raw material deposits, irrespective of the main product, efficient use of raw materials at every stage of processing, from the moment of extraction to the finished product; and full utilisation of the components of production, including the recycling of raw material.

The drive for economical use of materials is being stepped up. Targets are being set even higher than in the past and regulations made even stricter. New ideas and initiatives are being realised. For example, the whole economy has benefited greatly from the fact that a whole industry, metallurgy, has introduced high-precision metal rolling, which makes a big difference to the consumption of steel and non-ferrous metals. In 1976, for instance, 20,000 tons of rolled goods were saved. Another big saving device is the systematic collection and reprocessing of secondary raw material. Its importance to the economy can be seen from the fact that in 1975 the recycling of secondary raw material saved 2,500 million marks.

As a country that depends largely on imported materials the GDR has to be particularly aware of the problem of economising on raw materials. Ways of saving, even if they involve initial outlay, are becoming more and more important and at the same time we are learning to make them more effective.

Public initiative in saving materials is spreading. To encourage thrift, new wholesale prices are being introduced on products within the industrial system. In this important field of activity we are trying to achieve complete co-ordination between the interests of the economy as a whole and those of individual enterprises and industrial complexes. At the same time, in line with well-tried past practice retail prices, rents and service charges.

The importance of these major economic tasks is being increasingly appreciated by the public. The Party is conducting a broad campaign to help people to understand these problems as a whole. It is also becoming clear that any project for improving quality and reducing rejects is at the same time a project for husbanding raw materials.

Party organisations are orienting production teams towards operating all highly productive machinery in several shifts, so that it can be used to the full. The five-year plan lays it down that the operating time of highly productive machinery and equipment must be raised at a minimum rate of 3-4 per cent a year. This means that further introduction of the multi-shift system is becoming a key factor. Moreover we take into consideration the fact that increasing the return from basic assets is a complex process that has social implications. Careful thought must be devoted to the varied problems of organisation in the ideological, political and technological spheres, to the supply of goods, transport

and other services, professional training and retraining, intellectual and cultural life.

The SUPG considers it an important task to spread the idea that intensification means increasing output by modernising and better use of the basic assets available at present, while saving manpower and improving working and living conditions.

Stress on the STR

Whatever problem of intensification we are dealing with—saving and more efficient use of materials, boosting output and better utilisation of machines and equipment, improvement in the quality of goods or growth of productivity in general—the solution is bound to lie in systematic application of the advances of science and technology. Scientific and technical progress is the key to all aspects of socialist intensification. For the first time in history, thanks to socialism, the working class and its allies have the opportunity of putting science and technology entirely at the service of the people and using it for the benefit of man.

The realities of today provide striking confirmation of Marx's prediction that the whole process of production would become a technological application of science. As socialism advances it becomes increasingly clear that this process is being made to serve mankind, the interests of the working people, and does not contradict them, as it does in the industrially developed capitalist countries. This is particularly evident against the background of the present crisis in the capitalist world, where growing unemployment has a disastrous effect on the life of the working people and their families.

As a socialist country, the GDR is interested in the planned development of science and technology for the benefit of man. For us the STR is not a fetish and not an aim in itself. Science and invention, like the division and combination of labour and the use of machinery, are essential elements in the productive power of labour. Development of the economic potential is in many ways dependent on them. We are guiding science and technology so that they will further increase the national income and promote the Party's general policy.

This is the basis of the tasks formulated by Comrade Erich Honecker in his New Year address: accelerate scientific and technological progress in the economy as a whole and strive for the highest world standards in the main types of output and technology. This is a vital part of the struggle for successful fulfilment of the five-year plan.

In pushing ahead with this plan our Party realises that the GDR has already built up a substantial scientific and technological potential. Under the current five-year plan 35 billion marks will be invested in this field—10 billion more than under the previous plan. Every year our educational system is turning out growing numbers of young well-qualified specialists with all-round knowledge, capable of doing creative work and not frightened of big undertakings. In the Academy of Sciences and higher schools of the GDR the standard of fundamental research is rising. Scientific and technological co-operation with the Soviet Union, which makes for increasingly impressive results, is being built up. More and more striking scientific and technological achievements are being applied in the economy; the benefits from their use are increasing.

Our Party proceeds from the fact that socialist production relations have enormous advantages and create all the prerequisites for the full realisation of

scientific and technological advances in actual life, in specific economic and production results. As an example, we can cite such facts as the manufacture at the publicly owned Karl Zeiss, Jena Works of special photographic equipment that was used during the Soyuz-22 flight, and the commissioning of the world's first 30-ton plasma furnace at the high-quality steel factory in Freital. The Central Committee of the SUPG discussed at its recent plenums the results of the nationwide drive to achieve the highest world standards called for by the 9th Party Congress. It drew some fundamental conclusions. The essence of these conclusions is that on the basis of what has been already achieved, on the basis of the increased knowledge and experience of our cadres, their political maturity and deep devotion to their country and Party, we have every opportunity of achieving results like those mentioned above in all fields. Our inviolable fraternal alliance with the CPSU and the Soviet Union, the co-operation between the USSR and the GDR in science and the economy allow us to be pioneers in the scientific cognition of nature and society and in using the results achieved for the good of humanity.

The development of close scientific and technical co-operation with the USSR testifies to the fact that socialist economic integration as a whole is a powerful factor in intensification and raising production efficiency in the socialist countries. It multiplies our research potential. Often it is the only way of gaining new knowledge. It accelerates the application of results and makes it possible to organise large-scale rational production. It is advantageous to both countries.

The SUPG associates its successes in carrying out its national economic policy with giving the young people, specialists, researchers, engineers and workers, tasks that mobilise their energies. We believe in providing conditions that encourage them to work creatively. Our people are determined to achieve great things. Supporting this urge, our Party sees to it that the plans provide a fitting challenge. In our political and ideological work we also try to orient the working people towards big accomplishments that will help to develop socialism.

Thanks to the broad and varied ideological and political activities of our Party organisations, scientific and technological creativity is gaining in scope and greater efforts are being made in the search for solutions that will make our whole economy more efficient. Our people are trying even harder to accelerate scientific and technological progress. The Party and the state are dedicated to the idea of using and encouraging the readiness of the masses to reach the heights of science and technology.

In the drive to intensify production the Party lays special stress on the quality of management, on the personal responsibility of managers. It is mindful of the need for timely research and development and planning ahead to get results on the production line. We aim to bring fundamental and applied research even closer together, to shorten the period between the initial research and the practical application of its results. A lot here depends on stepping up the responsibility of the big industrial complexes for rationalising production and reconstruction. Progress in rationalisation and reconstruction is a decisive factor in the GDR economy.

It should be noted that more than 85 per cent of the planned growth of commodity production under the five-year plan is to be achieved through increased productivity of labour. In industry and construction nearly 1,200 million man-hours are to be saved by scientific, technological and investment

measures. The plan demands pressure on every branch of the economy to produce its own means of rationalisation. Between 1976 and 1980 production of the means of rationalisation has to be increased by 167 per cent.

To accelerate this process throughout the economy all big enterprises and industrial complexes are to set up their own special departments for making such devices. We envisage that such departments will become technological centres whose staffs will be able to evolve effective and economical processes, improve existing ones and get new inventions and rationalisation proposals on to the production line quickly. Their work will be an important step towards achieving top results on the scale of whole factories and complexes. The strategy of intensification is thus being realised in a concrete system of measures tailored to meet its needs.

The Socialist Unity Party of Germany regards fulfilment of the intensification targets set by the 9th Congress as a political goal of nationwide importance. This broad social approach to the problem is determined by the great importance that increasing our economic potential has for carrying out our programme of improving the people's well-being.

We also regard our efforts to achieve further advances in building socialist society, developing the economy, science and culture and achieving a steady rise in material and cultural standards as a contribution to the influence and attractive power of socialism throughout the world. The Communists of the GDR see this as a particularly honourable task in the year when mankind is celebrating the 60th anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution.

Commentary

NATO Against Detente

PETER BOYCHUCK

Alternate member, Executive Committee, CC Communist Party, Canada

UNTIL not so long ago the United States had quite a good tradition of not allowing its generals to make political speeches. When the generals objected on the grounds of free speech they were told that freedom should be used with discretion.

Unfortunately this tradition has been lost in recent years. The generals never stop making speeches, particularly those who fancy themselves as politicians and have been appointed to NATO headquarters.

Perhaps the most talkative of them all is Alexander Haig, Commander-in-Chief of NATO forces in Europe, whose military-political revelations regularly appear in the West European and North American press. He is always telling people in the West to beware of the Soviet Union's "offensive might" and "expansionist aims", but the real purpose of all the ballyhoo is to make the governments and parliaments of the NATO countries spend more on arms and put more men and weapons in the hands of General Haig. And what he needs them for is to build up international tension and pursue a deterrent policy against the socialist countries.

"Up to now the West's deterrent has been effective," Haig told a correspondent of the *Frankfurter Allgemeine zeitung* (February 18, 1977). "But its effectiveness could very soon be lost if the Western parliaments do not make a much greater effort now." In his role as arms salesman the general complained to the correspondent that most of the NATO partners had not been buying enough weaponry of late.

It is hard not to agree with the Western newspapers that traced a connection between General Haig's utterings and the only recently given promises of the new US administration to cut defence expenditure and clamp controls on the billion-dollar spendthrifts in the Pentagon. It must also be admitted that Haig and the NATO lobby have not wasted their time. The United States arms budget for the coming fiscal year is up again.

Alexander Haig is not the only person engaged in fanning war fever in the West. In a book *Defenceless Europe* that appeared this January his NATO colleague, the Belgian general Rober Close, warns "irresponsible politicians" that under certain circumstances the Russians could overrun West Germany in 48 hours. The Belgian defence minister, Paul Vanden Boeynants, banned Close from making any further public statements on this question. The general bowed to his authority, but only after the idea of a possible "Soviet invasion" had made headlines in the capitalist press.

The Belgian defence minister's decision to restrain the general from making such provocatory statements is to be welcomed as a wise step, but not every minister of state is capable of placing the interests of the nation and of international relations above his own sectional interests. A case in point is a statement by Georg Leber, German Federal Republic defence minister, which will certainly not further international understanding. His calls for a "permanent deterrent" show that he takes more notice of General Haig's speeches than of common sense. And common sense must tell him that the best thing for his country is not an arms build-up and preparations for a new war (which would mean total disaster for the Federal Republic) but a policy of detente backed by effective measures to curtail armaments.

The voices of active supporters of an aggressive Atlantic posture are heard from other NATO countries. Unfortunately, in my own country, Canada, there are quite a few persons in positions of responsibility who go along with those who try to scare the public with talk of "Soviet aggression", obviously with the aim of whipping up the arms race. At the 40th session of the Conference of Defence Associations, Prime Minister Trudeau called for a bigger arms budget, though he admitted that "the cost of defence reaches astronomical heights". He was, of course, supported by defence minister Danson, who charged Canadians with complacency in the face of the "Soviet threat". The object of the exercise is to browbeat Canadians into accepting the need for a steep rise in the country's arms bill.

A loud voice in Britain is Lord Chalfont's. Year after year he goes on warning the public of an imminent invasion of Europe by Soviet troops and demanding more money for arms. An article he wrote for *The Times* last year (March 15) was called "The West Must Act to Defend Itself While It Still has the Chance". Obviously the British reader was supposed to conclude that he had a very small chance of survival and that the only way of preserving it was to sacrifice his butter for guns.

After yet another broadside from General Haig the worthy lord reached the following profound conclusion: "If you employ an expensive, intelligent and highly trained guard dog, it is as well to pay attention when he barks" (*The Times*, November 8, 1976). Let Lord Chalfont himself answer for the tactfulness of that comparison in the lofty circles in which he moves. We can only remark that even highly trained dogs will bark for titbits from their masters.

Luckily, this is understood by many people in the West, including Britain. Replying to Lord Chalfont, Edmund Stevens, *The Times* Moscow correspondent wrote, "Haig and Chalfont are right in asserting a war danger exists. But they are barking up the wrong tree. As anyone familiar with the Soviet scene can attest. Russians are not planning a blitz attack against Western Europe" (*The Times*, January 26, 1977).

Stevens went on to sum up facts that are well known the world over. "Distinguished foreign visitors, including world leaders, who met Brezhnev recently, have come away with the impression he is anxious to ensure world peace and is keenly aware of the dire consequences of a nuclear conflict for all mankind" (*The Times*, January 26, 1977).

Developing his argument, Stevens cites the opinion of George Kennan, well-known Sovietologist and former US ambassador to the USSR. The former ambassador believes that the blame for the present deadlock in negotiations on curtailing the strategic arms race lies with the Pentagon. Kennan maintains that if the danger of world war is not to grow any bigger than it has been in the past there must be energetic efforts to curb the ambitions of the military-industrial complex and halt the arms race.

Britain's defence secretary, Roy Mason, also confirmed that last year NATO's expenditure was about $20,000 million more than equivalent spending by the Warsaw Treaty countries. NATO had a substantial numerical superiority over its "opponents" in regular personnel, he said.

Commenting on statements by Mason and NATO admiral Hill-Norton, a spokesman of the Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament, Brian Deer, said that the aim of foreign policy should be to relax tension. The British government, he said, should take the initiative now and cut arms expenditure, scrap its stocks of useless nuclear weapons, which are controlled by the Americans, and leave NATO unilaterally. The creation of NATO in 1949 heralded the nuclear arms race. Now it depends on NATO whether it will end, he declared.

True indeed! The North Atlantic politicians can say what they like and try to shift the blame how they like, but they cannot rewrite history. Nor will they escape public responsibility for setting up an aggressive bloc that has played a shameful part in the postwar history of mankind.

How was this bloc set up and what for? The growth of the Soviet Union's prestige during and after the Second World War, the formation of the world socialist system, the upsurge of the Communist and working class movement and the beginning of the colonial system's collapse changed the balance of forces in favour of socialism. In several West European countries the Communist movement had developed on a mass scale, millions were voting Communist there were Communists in the governments. This obviously called for action on the part of the leaders of the capitalist world. The "cold war" was launched with the aim of turning the tide of events both on the international scene and in the capitalist countries themselves.

The chief weapon of this "cold war" was the North Atlantic bloc, set up in April 1949. From the start it was dominated by the United States. It would have been naive, to say the least, for any of the junior partners in the alliance to have counted on parity in NATO. American militarists had not secured the key strategic positions in Western Europe just to share power with somebody else. They wanted political and economic supremacy. So it is hard to restrain a smile when one sees Sulzberger in the *International Herald Tribune* (March 7) giving it as his "frank opinion" that what was needed back in the fifties was a European commander-in-chief of the NATO forces. This would have demonstrated "true philosophical equality" in the North Atlantic alliance. But would it?

Fortune magazine, mouthpiece of the American monopolies, was getting nearer the heart of the matter, when it wrote that the United States could not withdraw from a continent that mattered as much to America strategically as Alaska. Well, no one will deny this journal's frankness. Perhaps the editors of *Fortune* think that comparing Western Europe to Alaska is a compliment to Western Europe. All they need to do now is to state their price.

The relaxation of international tension achieved thanks to the peaceful policy of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries was a big setback for the aggressive policy of the NATO warlords. The policy of detente that has won wide support in many countries over the past decade has exploded the idea of the Soviet "threat" and the impossibility of peaceful coexistence or co-operation between the socialist and capitalist powers. The result has been that the leading NATO countries have set about normalising relations with the USSR and other socialist countries of Europe. They have had to overcome internal resistance from the numerous "hawks" in their own countries who are reluctant to abandon their "deterrent". For example, in 1971 Lord Carrington, secretary for defence in Britain's Conservative government, advised "cooling the enthusiasm" of those who were in favour of detente. But the conclusion of the Soviet-American agreements on preventing nuclear war and further efforts to halt the race in strategic nuclear and other weapons have shown that there is a mutually acceptable road leading from confrontation to military detente.

There has been universal popular support for detente, expanded mutually-advantageous economic contacts, and scientific, technical and cultural co-operation of states with different social systems. This was bound to worry the imperialists and precipitate counteraction. For they saw the erosion of NATO's policy of "deterring" the socialist countries, were aware of the growing doubts about the advisability of maintaining NATO and of the growing tendency to dismantle it as unnecessary.

The Final Act of the Helsinki Conference came as a fresh blow to the arms drive and preparation of aggression policy. It expressed the people's will for peace and became a kind of code of European security and co-operation based on peaceful coexistence. The Helsinki Conference made a weighty contribution to detente.

The circles associated with the military-industrial complex in North America and Western Europe responded to the success of the peace forces with a campaign designed to aggravate the confrontation of the two blocs. They are using the NATO generals and Defence Ministers to intimidate European opinion with talk of the "menace of Soviet aggression". NATO propagandists are assiduously disseminating this piece of mythology but are studiously silent about

the official position of the socialist countries, set out with the utmost clarity by the leaders of their Communist and Workers' parties at the Crimean meeting of July 30-31, 1973: "The socialist countries consistently advocate complementing political detente with military detente, which would facilitate disarmament".

From the very early post-war years the socialist countries have repeatedly proposed reducing foreign and national armed forces in Europe. But every such proposal has been rejected by the NATO leadership. And it was only in 1973 in Vienna that the socialist and capitalist countries began negotiations on mutual reduction of armed forces and armaments.

These Vienna negotiations have so far failed to produce any concrete results. If the leaders of the NATO countries really wanted military detente, as they profess, they would long ago have accepted the socialist countries' proposals, based on the principle of not impairing the security of either side. Instead, the NATO delegations have advanced patently unacceptable proposals calling for disproportionate reductions that would give NATO unilateral advantages.

There is no getting away from the impression that the sole purpose of the Western powers at the Vienna talks is to achieve unilateral military advantages, impose on the socialist countries disadvantageous terms, while not assuming any obligations that would affect general Haig's freedom of action. Otherwise, how is one to explain why the NATO countries, while raising a hue and cry about the "Soviet menace" and the Soviet buildup in Central Europe, reject the proposal, which Leonid Brezhnev repeated at the 16th Soviet Trade Union Congress, to refrain from increasing armed forces in Central Europe for the duration of the Vienna talks? Moreover, while the Soviet Union and other socialist countries have, for a number of years, refrained from increasing the combat strength of their armed forces in Central Europe, the NATO countries have been steadily building up their armed forces.

The leaders of many Western countries have repeatedly acknowledged that the balance of armed forces in Central Europe between the socialist and capitalist countries is about even. Nevertheless, flouting all logic, NATO insists that the socialist countries should make a nearly three times bigger reduction than NATO.

Other facts could be cited to show that, while rejecting concrete and substantiated proposals, the Western negotiations in Vienna are advancing unrealistic and patently unacceptable plans based entirely on NATO's strategic interests.

A similar stand was taken by the US at the talks held in Moscow at the end of March this year on limitation of strategic offensive weapons. This was an attempt to revise the Vladivostok accord between Brezhnev and Ford to the unilateral advantage of the United States and the detriment of the security of the USSR and its allies. But why should the Soviet Union sacrifice its legitimate interests, its security?

It is to be hoped that Western bourgeois leaders who have had sufficient foresight to support a policy of relaxing international tensions will really take up the questions involved in military detente, i.e., restriction and reduction of armaments as the prelude to subsequent disarmament.

They have a good example to emulate: the peace policy of the Soviet Union, which is militarily the strongest of the socialist states, as expressed in pronouncements by its leaders and in concrete actions. At the October 1976 CC

CPSU plenum, Leonid Brezhnev stated that the Soviet Union was prepared to begin disarmament without delay—either large-scale, fundamental or, for a start, partial—on a just basis of reciprocity. Speaking in Tula in January of this year, Leonid Brezhnev reaffirmed that the Soviet aim was not superiority in armaments, but reduction of armaments and relaxation of the military confrontation.

These words have been backed by deeds. "While the US has been increasing its military budget annually," P. Rogers wrote in *Political Affairs*, the theoretical and political journal of the US Communist Party (Nov. 1976), "the Soviet military budget has been reduced. For the year 1977, the Soviet military budget was 17.2 billion rubles, or $23 billion, as compared to the US military budget of $112 billion." This year, too, the US is increasing its military spending instead of budgeting for the American people's social needs, while the USSR is slashing its arms budget by 200 million rubles. All told, since the 24th CPSU Congress in 1971 at which the Peace Programme was approved, the Soviet Union has made four cuts in defence spending. The same cannot be said about NATO military expenditure, which has increased from $18 billion in 1949 to $155 billion in 1976, and this not counting Greece and Turkey.

A key measure proposed by the USSR and other socialist countries as a means of extending and consolidating detente is simultaneous dismantling of NATO and the Warsaw Treaty Organisation, with dismantling of their military structures as a first step. The USSR repeated this proposal at the Berlin Conference of European Communist and Workers' Parties. Its acceptance would be as a realistic and rapid step towards military detente in Europe and would make for closer international trust and understanding.

However, judging from the reaction in Western capitals this, like other peace overtures by the socialist countries, does not have the support of the ruling circles. Apparently they are not yet prepared to abandon this effective instrument for stirring up tension and anti-Communism, as was evidenced by last year's round of NATO top-level conferences. Behind the smokescreen of talk about the "Eastern menace" one could see the real aim of this aggressive alliance, namely, to put through high-cost war-preparation programmes, including the continued build-up of the nuclear missile potential.

As was only to be expected, Secretary-General Joseph Luns of the anything but defensive NATO bloc turned down the Warsaw Treaty proposal that all signatories to the Helsinki agreement should pledge not to be the first to use nuclear weapons against each other. Another constructive proposal, not to enlarge existing military-political groupings, was likewise rejected.

With the best will in the world, one cannot accept that this attitude of the NATO leaders is motivated by defensive, humane or similar considerations. It can only be interpreted as part of NATO's agressive propensities.

The NATO leaders and primarily the US imperialists, are trying to dictate to West European nations what kind of governments they should have and what political parties the people should and should not support. Now as in the past, NATO serves as protector for the most reactionary European circles. Its aggressive, anti-democratic nature has repeatedly been demonstrated by its threats to various countries whenever the influence of the Communist or other left parties was growing, and by gross interference in their internal affairs.

We all remember NATO's role in the Greek military coup of April 1967; its

subversion against the sovereign republic of Cyprus, and against the nation liberation movements, particularly in southern Africa, and, the latest exampl its interference in the internal military conflict in Zaire.

According to General Haig, the question of "Marxist participation" in Western governments is the most serious question now confronting NATO. And since some people in Western capitals believe that Communist participation in the governments of big capitalist countries would bring on the dissolution of NATO, the General has served notice: "I will not agree to Marxist parties in the governments of the West-European industrial countries" (*L'Humanité*, Feb. 24, 1976).

This flagrant interference in the internal affairs of sovereign states has met with sharp protest from representatives of parties far removed from Marxism. But the protests have not prevented the US, FRG, British and French leaders from deciding, in June 1976, to deny Italy all financial and economic assistance if there are Communists in the government. Even the Conservative *Times* described this as "gross blackmail" by Italy's NATO allies.

Nor have we forgotten the more recent pressure put on Portugal. According to the Paris *Le Nouvel Observateur* (July 5, 1976) "at the very height of the events in Portugal, the Americans were discussing expelling Lisbon from NATO". Political bullying was supplemented by NATO manoeuvres in Portuguese waters.

Washington and certain other Western capitals evidently believe that international laws and agreements prohibiting interference in the internal affairs of other countries do not apply to them. Yes, they like to mention the Helsinki Final Act, but only to accuse someone else of violating it. While falsely charging the socialist countries with "human rights" violations, imperialist circles are doing their best to steer the world back into the "cold war". When they themselves come under fire for their interference in the affairs of other countries, for their attacks on the restricted bourgeois-democratic rights and freedoms that exist in the capitalist countries, they act as if the Final Act had never been signed.

This new spurt of NATO activity and its anti-Communist thrust are evidence of desperate attempts by this imperialist bloc to halt social progress on our planet. Standing opposed to that is the Soviet Union and other socialist countries and all the democratic, peace forces working for a healthier international climate, for mutually-advantageous co-operation between countries with different social systems.

The forthcoming Belgrade meeting of 35 nations can develop detente. But for that its participants have to remember that Helsinki was a conference on European security and co-operation. It would therefore be only logical for the Belgrade meeting to concentrate on peace, security and co-operation in Europe.

Europe's future lies not in confrontation of the two blocs, which would mean more hardship and the danger of military conflict. Europe's future is a continent without weapons, without military spending, without fear of war. The future is for a Europe advancing to social progress in conditions of durable peace. We Canadians have every reason to know that when peace reigns in Europe and international co-operation is developing, the political climate across the world is considerably improved.

Socialist Economic Integration and International Relations

KAZIMIERZ OLSZEWSKI
Central Committee Member, Polish United Workers' Party,
Vice-Chairman of the Council of Ministers,
Chairman of the CMEA Executive Committee

REFERRING to the strengthening friendship and co-operation of the socialist countries, their impressive achievements, growing strength and influence, Leonid Brezhnev, General Secretary of the CC CPSU, said in addressing the 25th CPSU Congress: "The socialist countries are playing an ever more prominent part in the world economy. The socialist community has now become the world's most dynamic economic force. In the past five years the industry of its member-countries grew four times as swiftly as that of the developed capitalist states. In 1975 the industrial output of the countries of our community was more than double that of the Common Market countries."

And referring to the role economic integration has played in all this, Leonid Brezhnev gave the following description of the 1971 long-range Comprehensive Programme of socialist economic integration: "This Programme, Comrades, raises co-operation among socialist countries to a much higher level than ordinary promotion of trade. For example, it means joint development of natural resources for their common benefit, joint construction of large industrial complexes to meet the needs of all the partners, and co-operation between our countries' enterprises, and whole industries planned for many years ahead. Implementation of the Comprehensive programme has already significantly deepened our economic interaction and made our economies mutually complementary to a greater extent and to the considerable advantage of all concerned."

This is a terse and vivid description of the main features and trends of the present stage, which will determine the development of the socialist economic community in the years ahead. Among these features are steady, dynamic growth of the member-countries' economic potential and planned extension of socialist economic integration.

Encouraging Results

The CMEA countries' economic development in the first half of the seventies has once more confirmed the superiority of the socialist system and the correctness of the economic policy of their Communist and Workers' Parties. The aim of that policy is continued allround economic development through wider use of the intensive growth factors latent in modern industry and in the achievements of the technological revolution.

Economic progress is best measured by the growth of national income. And in the CMEA countries it rose by approximately 36 per cent in 1971-75, a much steeper rise than the 14 per cent increase in the developed capitalist countries and the Common Market's 12 per cent.

The high economic performance of the CMEA countries is due primarily to the dynamic development of their industry. Their industrial output for 1975 was up 45 per cent on 1970. High growth rates, higher than in any capitalist country, have been maintained for many years. This, too, is an example of the advantages of the socialist mode of production. Industrial output in developed capitalist countries increased only 9 per cent in the first half of the 70s, and only 7 per cent in the Common Market countries. There is also this inherent feature of socialist economic growth: the highest growth rates in the CMEA community were achieved in the once industrially backward countries. For instance, Romania showed a rise of 85 per cent, Poland 66 per cent, Bulgaria 55 per cent, Mongolia 55 per cent and Cuba 50 per cent.

In most CMEA countries the highest growth rates have been in industries basic to continued technical progress and accelerated expansion—energy, machine-building and chemicals, and within these industries such specialised branches as electronics, electrical engineering, high-performance machine-tools, synthetic materials, etc., which are key elements of the modernisation and restructuring that make for higher effectiveness of the entire national economic organism.

The new technology, now being introduced on an ever wider scale, plus more efficient techniques, have significantly heightened the productivity of social labour. Measured in terms of national income per worker, in 1971-75 it rose by more than 30 per cent in the CMEA community. Industrial modernisation can be gauged by the growth of labour productivity in industry. Thus, in the past five years it increased by 33 per cent as compared with 30 per cent in 1966-1970. To this should be added that about 80 per cent of the increment in industrial output in the CMEA community in 1971-1975 was achieved through higher productivity. The figures for the individual countries are 70 per cent for Bulgaria, 89 for Czechoslovakia, 85 for the German Democratic Republic, over 70 for Poland, 55 for Romania, 97 for Hungary and 84 for the Soviet Union.

Dynamic economic progress has found expression also in the foreign trade of the CMEA countries, which was 12 per cent above the target figures envisaged in their 1971-75 trade agreements, with an annual average increase of 14.4 per cent, as against 8.2 per cent in the previous five-year period.

Furthermore, this growth was not achieved by raising prices, as is the case in the capitalist world. For prices in trade between the CMEA countries were changed only in 1975, with due account of the interests of all the partners, and stand no comparison with price escalation on the capitalist market.

It will thus be seen that the high growth of foreign trade between CMEA countries is primarily the result of their economic development and operation of the Comprehensive Integration Programme, which has had beneficial results for all our countries.

It is not the purpose of this article to give a panoramic picture of the dynamic socialist economy. That has been done in a number of more detailed studies. I propose to deal with tendencies characteristic of the present economic situation of the CMEA countries and which will shape their trade and economic intercourse in the years ahead.

Dynamic economic development is a key precondition for strengthening their economic, scientific and technological co-operation. It was raised to a higher plane in 1971, the initial year of a long-range and planned integration process. With higher economic potentials, integration became an essential factor of

continued social and economic development in the interests of each member country and of the community as a whole. And the importance of integration grows with the economic development of each country.

And so, successful fulfilment of social and economic plans over the past five years and related joint measures became the basis for deeper economic integration. Now we are tackling the new problems posed by the growing requirements and potentialities of all the members of our community.

New Stage

It can be said that economic, scientific and technical co-operation between members of CMEA is entering a new stage.

In the coming years, the growing economic requirements of the CMEA countries will confront us with bigger and more complex problems. This, in turn, will require new forms and methods of economic, scientific and technical co-operation.

We shall have to form longer-term trade, economic, scientific and technical contacts, for the economies of the CMEA countries are now more closely interconnected. This lends more importance to joint planning as an integral part of national socio-economic planning. In fact, long-range development in many industries and lines of production often depends on such joint planning. In other words, the task facing CMEA and its member-states is to extend and perfect planning techniques. Plan co-ordination has from the very start been a prominent feature of the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance, and its Comprehensive Programme recommends widening its scope so as to more closely dove-tale national plans.

Last year, in co-ordinating national economic plans for 1976-1980, we worked out a number of measures to promote close interaction of central planning agencies and economic organisations in working out long-term trade and economic exchanges. This has made for more effective joint work in compiling development forecasts for the economy, science and technology; also joint planning of production of certain types of goods (for instance, digital machine-tools, containerisation machinery); establishment of international specialised organisations and amalgamations on production and supply of certain types of equipment for such industries as electronics, textiles, atomic-energy.

But the most ambitious piece of co-ordination was the drafting of a plan for joint multilateral undertakings in 1976-1980. Approved at the 29th session of the Council in 1975, it envisages large-scale projects with investments coming from interested CMEA countries, and also agreements on production specialisation and co-operation and joint solution of scientific and technological problems.

This plan differs from all previous ones by the fact that the CMEA countries have made provisions within the framework of their national plans and have appropriated the necessary material and financial resources to carry out these projects, which they regard as an organic part of their own development programmes. What we have, therefore, is a kind of common plan which, however, retains all the traits of the national plans of the CMEA countries and in no way limits their independent economic activity.

Along with the five-year bilateral trade agreements, the new plan has become an important instrument for effectively co-ordinating the economic development of the CMEA countries.

Though co-ordination of national plans is an important and effective factor, it has to be said that it has not substantially lengthened the period, usually five years, covered by existing bilateral trade and economic agreements. The multilateral plan of integration measures, especially joint investment projects, will operate up to 1980, with longer arrangements made only for reciprocal delivery of a relatively short list of items. One should not, of course, minimise their importance, especially of such joint investment projects as development of natural-gas and iron-ore deposits in the Soviet Union. Nonetheless, it has to be observed that the total cost of all these joint projects is 9 billion roubles, or a fraction of the amount involved in trade between the CMEA member-countries in a five-year period.

The leaders of the Communist and Workers' Parties and the governments of the CMEA countries have decided that co-ordination of economic plans for the period following 1980 should concentrate on pooling their efforts to achieve comprehensive and long-range solutions of the following problems:

—satisfying the CMEA countries' economically substantiated requirements for basic types of energy, fuel and raw materials;

—co-ordinated development of engineering based on production specialisation and co-operation;

—satisfaction of the CMEA countries' rational requirements in basic foods;

—satisfaction of rational requirements in industrial goods;

—expansion of transport links between the CMEA countries;

—increasing their contribution to equalising economic development levels.

The 29th CMEA session in 1975 decided to draw up long-term co-ordination programmes on all these problems. Last year's 30th Council session approved detailed directives and set a timetable for the completion of this work by CMEA agencies and member-countries and all CMEA agencies are now concentrating on drawing up these programmes. This work will take about two years and its results may be used in co-ordinating national economic plans for the period after 1980. The programmes will outline concrete measures for 10 to 15 years and will be made the basis for multilateral and bilateral agreements and treaties setting out the obligations of CMEA members in such areas as scientific research, joint capital investments, production, mutual deliveries, and co-operation with third countries.

New Dimensions

The long-term comprehensive programmes cover a very wide range of questions. There has been nothing comparable in scale and complexity in the whole history of CMEA co-ordination of economic development. The targets are formidable but attainable because our countries have all the necessary resources: natural wealth, manpower, a sufficiently developed material and technical base and ample experience in economic planning and co-operation.

The drawing up of such programmes depends on the internationalist readiness of the CMEA countries to make joint use of their raw material and other resources along with their production, scientific and technological potential for developing each country and the socialist community as a whole. Such socialist solidarity has well-established economic roots. If one considers the present level of the CMEA countries' economic development, their long term needs and world economic trends, it becomes clear that some of the socialist countries could not

cope with many of the fundamental problems of continued socio-economic advance, relying entirely on their own resources.

It cannot be asserted, of course, that the need for integration is the same in all the CMEA countries, it may depend on a lack of certain natural resources, insufficient know-how, restricted demand on the home market for goods that have to be up to the highest world standards, and so on. The differing scales of the economies give rise to different demands. But despite the variety of their specific conditions there are at best two sets of causes prompting the CMEA countries to push ahead with economic integration as one of the most important means of solving the problems of economic growth. The first is to guarantee raw material supply over as long a period as possible and adopt the most rational methods of using it. This applies mainly to energy and fuel because some CMEA countries are short of energy resources and the world energy market has been dangerously unstable of late. We believe that a certain independence of the violent fluctuations on the world fuel market is an essential condition for steady CMEA economic development.

The strengthening of this independence demands measures connected with the extraction of fuel, production of generators and installation of power-saving technology in every branch of industry and the economy. All kinds of energy resources must be used in rational proportions, including those that till recently—in view of the apparent cheapness of liquid fuels—were not widely used. In the not far distant future atomic power should become an important supplier of our needs.

CMEA experience in meeting the community's raw material and fuel requirements—particularly co-ordination of national economic plans for 1976-80—suggests that in future we shall continue to maintain a high rate of economic development. The solution of energy and raw material problems is well underway. Moreover, the Soviet Union, the richest of the CMEA countries in raw materials, has shown—and this must be stressed—a wide understanding of the problem. We see confirmation of this in such joint projects as the laying of the gas pipeline from the source of the Orenburg area to the western border of the USSR, or the joint investment of capital to boost iron ore extraction on Soviet territory.

The second, no less important factor that makes deeper integration imperative is the need to equip the economy with the best and most up-to-date machinery, apparatus, transport, etc., which will stimulate a stable, economically efficient rate of development of material production and services. Of decisive importance in this respect is the demand for maximum sophistication and quality both to satisfy the CMEA countries' needs and strengthen their position as exporters of machinery and equipment to the markets of third countries. Though some progress has been made, the CMEA countries still have a long way to go in this direction.

The production and scientific potential we have at present is sufficient to ensure that co-operation in electrical engineering will become the decisive factor of technical progress throughout the socialist community. Collaboration in research and development has first priority. This is to be followed by a deepening of international specialisation and co-operation of production. This is not a new problem. The CMEA has gained a good deal of experience in tackling it over the past 10 years or more. The forms and methods have been evolved and, in recent years extended thanks to the Comprehensive Programme of Socialist Economic

integration. They provide a framework for effective solutions to the challenging production, technical and trade problems involved in specialisation of electrical machinery and equipment. The task now is to co-ordinate the long-term programme embracing all, or as many as possible of, the demands of the national economies and at the same time concentrating on the technical and production problems which only international specialisation and co-operation of production can solve economically.

The planning of collaboration between the CMEA countries for satisfying their fuel and energy requirements and the need for modern machinery and equipment is the crucial factor in devising effective programmes in other fields, such as boosting production of food, industrial goods and means of transport, and bringing all the CMEA countries up to a similar economic level.

The Socialist Countries and World Economic Relations

The development strategy of the CMEA countries as already stated, hinges on economic integration. At the same time their plans take into account the fact that detente creates favourable conditions for the expansion of economic co-operation between countries with different social systems. The documents of the 25th CPSU Congress, the 7th PUWP Congress and the congresses of the Communist and Workers' parties of other fraternal countries stress that such co-operation is an effective instrument for achieving both economic and political objectives. It is noted, specifically, that the development of stable, long-term, equitable relations with non-socialist countries is economically advantageous for both sides, encourages detente and provides a kind of material base for peaceful coexistence.

"We are striving for a broad expansion of equal, mutually advantageous economic co-operation free of barriers and restrictions, " stated Edward Gierek, First Secretary of the PUWP CC, at the Berlin Conference of European Communist and Workers' parties in 1976. "The CMEA's initiative on a treaty with the EEC is intended to promote this. We should like to solve general European problems together, problems such as the fuel-energy system, the transport infrastructure and protection of the environment."

In practice, however, the building of such relationships encounters various obstacles, both political—erected by the opponents of detente and contacts between countries with opposing social systems; and economic—due to the capitalist mode of production and its pernicious effects on the world economy. The latter include such glaring anachronisms in international economic relations as discrimination, diktat, inequality, exploitation, dependence and subordination, cyclical fluctuations of supply and demand in world trade, an unfair price system, and so on. These evils of the world capitalist system bite deep into the development of the newly-free countries, which in recent years have launched an active campaign to rebuild international economic relations on a just foundation.

The desire of the developing countries to end the system of economic inequality, discrimination, exploitation and monopoly domination met with understanding and support from the socialist countries from the outset. Their position on this issue is clear. It is determined by the fact that both the developing and the socialist countries are objectively interested in reshaping international economic relations to end exploitation and injustice in this sphere, set up

machinery preventing the negative effects of capitalism on the world economy. At various international forums, in the United Nations, and conferences of international organisations, and so on, the socialist countries give vigorous support to the just demands of the developing countries of Asia, Africa, and Latin America for the abolition of all forms of exploitation by the capitalist states of their worker partners among the young countries. The Soviet Government's statement of October 4, 1976, "On Rebuilding International Economic Relations" is, in my view, an important landmark on this road. Its proposals on what precisely should be rebuilt and what means should be used to create international economic relations on the principles of democracy and justice have been supported by other socialist countries.

Economic co-operation between the socialist and developing countries has been going on for nearly 30 years. The experience gained allows us to make certain generalisations and assessments that shed light on many aspects of contemporary international economic life.

First, I should like to mention the main feature of this co-operation, which expresses its fundamental class character in comparison with external economic relations in the context of the world capitalist economy. I have in mind the fact that the socialist countries have never engaged in any form of exploitation, have never been colonisers, and consequently have no historical debt to pay for the centuries of pillaging of former colonial peoples and their resources. This debt lies fairly and squarely on the capitalist countries, on their monopolies.

By contrast, the economic relations of the developing countries with the socialist community have played a major, and for some of them (India, Egypt, Afghanistan, Syria, Iraq, Algeria, and others), decisive role in building-up their state-run economies, economic planning, and training skilled workers, technicians, engineers and scientists. Moreover, the funds allocated by the socialist countries for these purposes do not come out of profits made in the young states, but are genuinely disinterested aid, provided by the unselfish labour of the peoples of the fraternal socialist countries. The political, economic and military assistance given by the Soviet Union and the whole socialist community has played a crucial part in promoting the formation and consolidation of the independent young states on the international scene, particularly those that have not fallen into neocolonialist bondage and have maintained their integrity and independence.

The relations between the socialist and the developing countries are devoid of all discrimination, inequality and exploitation. For instance, more than ten years ago the Soviet Union abolished all duty on imports from the developing countries, while the other fraternal socialist countries reduced it to a nominal level. They provide most favourable terms for the industrial exports of the developing countries and encourage their industrialisation. Between 1971 and 1975 the average annual growth rate of imports of finished and semi-finished goods from these countries to the socialist countries was roughly 22 per cent, and in the last two years of the period, more than 35 per cent. The CMEA countries have completed or will complete more than 3,000 construction projects in the developing countries.

All this shows how wrong it is, when dealing with the problems of reforming international economic relations, to treat the socialist countries on the same plane as the capitalist countries. The advocates of this approach, usually taking

as their yardstick the GNP, the per capita income and other similar quantitative indices, put both capitalist and socialist countries in the "rich" category, assign to them practically the same responsibility for the difficult economic position of the developing countries, and make the same claims on them. Clearly, this treatment of the problem of underdevelopment and the ways of resolving it can only benefit those who seek to hide the true causes of the young states' economic troubles, and shield those who are to blame. Both in the past and in the present the main responsibility for this lies not with the "rich" countries in general, but with imperialism, with the capitalist monopolies, who are ruthlessly exploiting the "fringe" of the world capitalist economy and pumping the profits made there into the industrially developed capitalist countries. I should like to note also that the concept of "rich" and "poor" countries, in the final analysis, tends to isolate the progressive forces in the developing countries from their natural allies—the socialist countries, the working class in the capitalist countries and other movements working for social progress.

The reliability of trade and economic co-operation between the socialist and the developing countries has proved its worth in the face of the grave world economic crisis. The leaders of the newly-free countries are becoming more and more aware of the fundamentally different nature of this co-operation as compared with the relations their countries enter into with the capitalist states. This was reflected, for example, in the Manila Declaration, passed by a conference of developing countries at ministerial level in Febraury 1976. The declaration departed significantly from the previous practice of making identical demands on the socialist and developed capitalist countries. At the 4th session of UNCTAD held last May in Nairobi, a resolution was passed on trade between countries with different social systems. During the debate the demand on the socialist countries for assistance amounting to one per cent of their GNP was withdrawn.

The foreign policy activity of the socialist countries, their equal and fair relations with the developing countries substantially restrict imperialism's ability to dictate to the newly-free countries the conditions of their political and economic development. Of course, imperialism still possesses certain ways of pressuring the "Third World" and a certain freedom of manoeuvre, but in general its former might is diminishing. The trend of events shows that with the present balance of class forces in the world the newly-free countries are quite capable of standing up to imperialist dictates and obtaining fair, by which I mean, equitable economic relations.

The prospects of the developing countries' struggle for the rebuilding of international economic relations are closely tied up with the struggle of the progressive peace-loving forces for extension and deepening of detente, for the creation of a reliable system of security in all parts of the world. Detente holds out to the developing countries a sure economic and political advantage from the standpoint of solving the problems of underdevelopment. Specifically, it opens up definite possibilities of switching the military sections of the economy to peaceful lines, which will have a beneficial effect on external economic ties, while the limitation of military pressure as an instrument of policy will make it easier for the young states to set about refashioning the old economic order, for instance, to nationalise the property of foreign monopolies. So it would be wrong to separate, let alone counterpose, the struggle for detente and disarmament, on

he one hand, and the struggle for reforming international economic relations, on he other.

There is obviously common ground between the fundamental aspirations of he socialist and the developing countries on a series of key questions of ontemporary world development. This common ground forms a sound basis on which co-operation between the socialist community and the states that have risen as a result of the collapse of the colonial system will continue to grow. Such o-operation is one of the crucial factors in the developing countries' progress nd enhancement of their role in world social and historical development.

Proletarian Internationalism and the Revolutionary Process in Africa

AMATH DANSOKO
CC Politbureau member, African Independence Party of Senegal

DISCUSSION of the principles on which Communists base their actions is quite natural.[1] Marxism-Leninism is not a ossified set of rules. It provides heoretical generalisations of the historical experience and present-day practice of the class struggle on both the national and international planes. It is therefore logical for us to exchange views on the question of internationalism, its content, place and forms, at the current stage of the world revolutionary process. We should like to make our modest contribution to this discussion by considering in detail one aspect of the problem.

It is generally accepted that our epoch, the epoch of transition from capitalism to socialism on a world scale, generates massive and deep-going economic, social and political changes in the life of individual nations and in nternational relations and brings to light all kinds of new problems. The changes occurring in the world today are primarily a result of the joint anti-imperialist struggle waged by the three great forces of modern times: the socialist world system, the international working-class movement and the national-liberation movement. Though imperialism may have considerable reserves, the advances of the world revolutionary process have deprived it of he historical initiative. But we mention this predominant feature of the contemporay world not just in order to refer to a generally accepted fact.

The solution to the grave problems facing humanity is directly and specifically connected with the transforming activity of the revolutionary forces, with the defeats they are inflicting on international imperialism, that constant source of war, domination and exploitation. Hundreds of millions of people in Asia, Africa and Latin America today are suffering from starvation, poverty and other afflictions. The responsibility for this lies with the capitalist world system and its offspring—imperialism. And the solution of such vitally important problems as the economic recovery of countries liberated from colonialism, the rebuilding of international economic and other relations on

the principles of justice, depends to a great extent on further shifts in the global balance of forces towards peace, democracy and socialism, on the continued curbing of the wolf-pack laws of capitalism.

As we see it, this is why the historical initiative won by the fighters for progress and socialism in the battle against imperialism, their offensive spirit, can be maintained and boosted only on the basis of a further consolidation of the anti-imperialist ranks, by further application of the principles of international solidarity, which have provided the foundation of all revolutionary victories in modern times.

In present-day conditions, of course, the spectrum of the social and political forces fighting imperialism and capitalism has widened considerably. The organisational and other forms of this struggle on the national and international levels have undoubtedly become more varied. It would be a mistake to ignore the problems arising therefrom, just as we cannot afford to underestimate the role of each of the new contingents taking part in the anti-imperialist and anti-capitalist movement. However, none of this leads us to the conclusion that is sometimes drawn about the "inadequacy" or "limitations" of proletarian internationalism as the basis of the policy of solidarity pursued by the international Communist and working-class movement. Our point of view is fortified, specifically, by the position held on this question by the progressive forces of our continent—Africa—although in other respects their views and character may differ.

It should be noted that the Communists' adherence to the principle of proletarian internationalism in no way signifies sectarianism or failure to appreciate the contribution made by other forces who aim at the complete or partial transformation of society. On the contrary, the Communists' policy has always been designed to achieve maximum unity among all those who fight against imperialism and for progressive social change. The Communists do not regard ideological differences as an obstacle to joint action. While stressing the proletarian internationalist basis of their policy of solidarity, they have never tried to impose this concept on allies who cannot yet accept it or perhaps even reject it altogether. On the other hand, such incomprehension or rejection places the Communists under no obligation to abandon the principle of proletarian internationalism or restrict it to a framework acceptable to non-proletarian allies at the given stage of development. This is the line that the Communists have consistently adopted on the African continent, where, as we know, the leading detachment in the progressive process that is remoulding society in many countries is a social segment of non-proletarian origin—the revolutionary democrats.

As regards the mistakes of a sectarian character that occurred in the policy-making of certain individual Communist parties, these were by no means due to adherence to proletarian internationalism. And when one hears that this adherence is tantamount to a refusal to take into consideration the changes that have happened in the world and threatens to put the Communists in a position of "isolation", and that it closes the door to fruitful revolutionary practice, one feels bound to conclude that the error in such assertions lies in the way the problem has been presented.

If such allegations were true, it would indeed be hard to understand the highly significant victories won in recent years by the international revolu-

tionary movement. Above all, we have in mind the historic victory of the people of Vietnam, achieved under the leadership of its Communist Party, which in all its activities based itself on proletarian internationalism. Kaysone Phomvihane, General Secretary of the People's Revolutionary Party of Laos, has written in this journal about the decisive significance of this victory for the victory of the Laotian people.[2] As regards our own continent, the liberation of the Portuguese colonies, achieved under the leadership of the revolutionary-democratic forces and organisations, was a striking illustration of the vitality of proletarian international solidarity.

The notable thing is that these forces and organisations show no inclination whatever to cast doubt on the principle of proletarian internationalism. And this is by no means due to a desire to "keep up the tradition" at all costs, regardless of reality. Awareness of the organic link between the liberation struggle in one's own country with the world-wide struggle against imperialism has persuaded them of the viability and necessity of this principle. As President Samora Machel of Mozambique stressed during the recent FRELIMO Congress: "Our Party is an internationalist party. We realised the importance of proletarian internationalism in the long years of the battle for national liberation."

In tropical Africa all the countries that have chosen a realistic socialist orientation recognise proletarian internationalism as a factor of exceptional importance for the national-liberation movement in both past and present stages. What makes this fact all the more significant is that the people and organisations in power in these countries that have emerged in the past 20 years certainly did not adopt all the theoretical principles of the Communist movement, whatever the influence of the Communists. There is no insuperable barrier between the objectives of general anti-imperialist and proletarian solidarity, although the two concepts should not, of course, be confused. So it is quite natural that in the eyes of the Democratic Party of Guinea, the MPLA, the Congolese Party of Labour, FRELIMO, the revolutionaries of Somali, Ethiopia and Benin, the movement they are directing against imperialism and capitalism on both the national and international plane should be very closely connected with proletarian internationalism.

There is nothing "passé" or backward-looking in this attitude. It springs from determination to resolve the basic contradiction between their peoples and imperialism in a revolutionary way, making full use of the opportunities afforded to the national-liberation movement by the existence of the powerful socialist camp, the international proletariat and their vanguard—Marxist-Leninist parties. And it should be specially noted that the ideological evolution of the revolutionary-democratic parties and organisations towards Marxism-Leninism (some of them already recognise it as their ideology) in no way detracts from their own original features, which incidentally are something that no one in the communist movement would think of "reproaching" them for. On the contrary, this originality, this national character, has been emphasised in the official documents of the world communist movement. The efforts of the revolutionary-democratic parties and organisations to effect the anti-capitalist changes are actively supported by the countries of the socialist community, by Communists the world over.

As we know, the socialist-oriented countries cannot for a number of reasons

abandon their fairly close economic and other ties with individual Western countries and hence with the capitalist world as a whole, which thus exerts and will for a time continue to exert considerable influence on various aspects of their economic and social life. But this only increases the significance for these countries of the factor of solidarity and support from the world's progressive forces, particularly world socialism, which is based on proletarian internationalism.

The weekly *Etumba*, central organ of the Congolese Party of Labour, gives a clear formulation of the position of these countries: "*Proletarian internationalism* is the best term to express the splendid ties of solidarity (between the oppressed peoples of the world and the socialist countries—*A. D.*). . . . In their insidious propaganda the imperialists and their yesmen have buried proletarian internationalism a good many times. But what has been the result? Proletarian solidarity has shown itself time and again lately in many parts of the world. . . . Angola, our closest neighbour, though besieged by reactionary aggressive forces, emerged from its difficult situation only thanks to the practical application of proletarian internationalism."[3] And it is not accidental that representatives of the socialist-oriented countries and organisations of Tropical Africa speaking at Communist party congresses and various anti-imperialist gatherings unfailingly and unanimously declare: "Long live proletarian internationalism!"

On March 15, 1976, in Konakri, in the presence of Agostinho Neto, Luiz Cabral and Sekhou Toure, the leaders of Angola, Guinea-Bissau and the Republic of Guinea, Fidel Castro described the lessons of the events in Angola to tens of thousands of Guineans who had assembled there. Angola, he said, has every right "to turn for help to the revolutionary peoples, because imperialism is strong and no small country, like Cuba, like Angola, can repel imperialist aggression alone and unaided. *The revolutionary camp exists*, the revolutionary movement exists, proletarian internationalism exists, and if imperialism wants to know what proletarian internationalism is, Angola is a fine example."[4]

President Neto, expressing his gratitude to the Cuban people and their Communist Party for the fraternal assistance rendered to the Angolan people's struggle, declared in his speech in Pinar del Rio: "We are here to reaffirm our loyalty to the principle of proletarian internationalism, which has made it possible to turn blood ties and a common history into an invincible force bringing freedom, independence and happiness to our peoples."[5]

This principled position does not in the least imply any sectarian bigotry or doctrinaire isolation on the part of the socialist-oriented states of Tropical Africa in their approach to the major continental and international problems. They belong to the Organisation of African Unity, where they maintain a firm anti-imperialist course. Motivated by the deep aspirations of the African masses, these states have been able to neutralise all the attempts to push the OAU into one or another form of pro-imperialist policy. Of course, the Organisation of African Unity contains a very mixed bag of political forces. Some countries belonging to the OAU are obviously vulnerable to imperialist influence. The events in Angola showed the reality of inter-African contradictions. But they also demonstrated the great opportunities that the progressive countries have both on the African continent and in the international field

for thwarting imperialist conspiracies, securing national independence and advancing along the road to socialism.

The same may be said of the movement of non-alignment. Such socialist countries as Cuba and Vietnam take part in this movement without seeing any contradiction between their adherence to proletarian internationalism and joint efforts with the other members to find solutions to international problems. There is no such contradiction and it is characteristic that even conservative-minded regimes in the Afro-Asian world make no attempt to raise the question of "incompatibility" between proletarian internationalist policy and the non-alignment movement.

The facts corroborate that proletarian internationalism does not ignore the specifics of our age, that it has not been ruled out by the realities of the contemporary revolutionary struggle. On the contrary, it is extremely viable and opens to the road for a flexible policy of alliances that may vary in character and depth.

As regards the struggle for socialism, it is worth mentioning one of the fundamental theses of Marxism stressed by Lenin: "Socialist dreams turned into the socialist struggle of the millions only when Marx's scientific socialism had linked up the urge for change with the struggle of a definite class. Outside the class struggle, socialism is either a hollow phrase or a naive dream." (*Coll. Works*, Vol. 9, p. 443.)

The alliance of the national liberation movement of Tropical Africa with the socialist community as its main bulwark and support is indeed one of the forms of linking the "urge for change" with the struggle of a definite class. Life shows convincingly that the socialist world system, the chief gain and achievement of the international working class, is blazing the main trail of mankind's present and future development and is a reliable stronghold of the people's struggle for national and social liberation.

---

[1] See *WMR*, January, February and March 1977.

[2] K. Phomvihane, The Victory of Creative Marxism-Leninism in Laos, *WMR*, March 1977.

[3] *Etumba*, No. 404, June 12-19, 1976.

[4] *Horoya*, 20.3.1976.

[5] *Granma*, 28.7.1976.

Export of Capital—One of the Essential Bases of Imperialism

JOHN PURTON
British Economist

IN the present stage of the general crisis of capitalism, with its entangled knot of acute contradictions, imperialism is attempting to bolster its shaken positions by mustering internal resources. From the catalogue of capitalism's "adaptive reactions" we shall examine the export of capital described by

---

WMR received this article by John Purton not long before he passed away.

Lenin as "... one of the most essential economic bases of imperialism." (*Coll. Works*, Vol. 22, p. 277.)

Export of capital is crucial to capitalism's international economic intercourse. There has been a growth of foreign investments in the postwar period as a result of state-monopoly measures encouraging capital export, expanding capitalist integration and lifting barriers to international migration of capital. This growth is propelled by the race for maximum profits just as it was at the writing of "Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism". "The need to export capital," Lenin wrote, "arises from the fact that in a few countries capitalism has become 'over-ripe' and ... capital cannot find a field for 'profitable' investment" (ibid, p. 242).

In its present stage capital export is closely bound up with operations of the multinational corporations whose rapid expansion in the last 15 years has become a prominent feature of the development of modern capitalism.

The first international imperialist monopolies appears at the dawn of the twentieth century. Although at the initial stages of imperialist development, such a level of concentration and centralisation of capital and the transformation of national monopolies into international was not yet typical, it was already noticed by Lenin. Examining the formation of international cartels, of "supermonopolies", he wrote: "This is a new stage of world concentration of capital and production, incomparably higher than the preceding stages" (ibid, p. 246).

At the onset of the 1960s the intensity of mutual penetration of foreign capital had reached a level suggesting new types of international monopolies and of a definite departure of state-monopoly capital from a national environment.

International monopolies are already in control of approximately a third of the total gross national product of the non-socialist countries. According to statistics for the first half of the 1970s, foreign branches of the international monopolies produce more goods in volume than the world capitalist export.

Such transnational giants are vigorously integrating themselves into the world capitalist system. Internationalising the phases of the production cycle and circulation and supported by the governments of the base countries, the international monopolies are putting the advantages of international division of labour to good use.

Bourgeois economists like J. K. Galbraith have maintained that the scope of such giants permits effective economic planning (*The New Industrial State*, New York, 1968; *Economics and the Public Purpose*, Boston, 1973). This vain hope has been dashed by the unforeseen depth of the "recession" in the middle seventies. Indubitably, such developments extend what Engels called the "socialisation of production". It failed, however, to eradicate the basic contradictions; it only reproduced them on a larger scale.

The escalating growth of the transnational corporations is a clear example of the contradiction deriving from the uneven development of monopoly capitalism, stressed by Lenin, and the sharpening struggle between the three main centres of capitalism—the USA, Western Europe and Japan. For their part, the international monopolies, effective levers in interimperialist rivalry working for the economic and political goals of certain capitalist countries and for the economic reshaping of the capitalist world, operate in their own

nterests which often contradict the interests of the base countries. This injects dditional chaos and instability into the world economy, is a factor of the ineven development of capitalism and the material base for a further worsenng of interimperialist contradictions.

Most transnational giants are based in the United States. Of the 7,276 international corporations existing in the early seventies, a third and most owerful, has their main centres in the USA. The United Kingdom is in the econd place with about 25 per cent, and the FRG is in third place.[1]

In the last 25 years the US international monopolies had established over 0,000 foreign branches.[2] These international monopolies, however, have been eriously rivalled in recent years by West European and Japanese multiational corporations, whose role in export of capital is growing. The cost of rticles manufactured by multinational corporation branches in Europe and he direct foreign investments are almost level with the identical indices of US nternational monopolies. Economists predict that Japan could become a leadng capital exporter by 1980.

Besides their rivalry there also seems to be a definite trend among the MNC o form blocs, particularly in countries where the foreign monopolies are hreatened with nationalisation. For example, the "Council of the Americas" s made up of over 200 US corporations with interests in Latin America.

But, the MNC never loses sight of its main goal of ensuring conditions for road economic expansion, growing profits, strengthening imperialist positions s a whole and of national imperialism in particular. The MNC strive to reate a socio-political climate in the emerging nations for their unhampered xploitation of raw materials and labour.

However, when considering MNC operations there emerges an apparent ontradiction of the neocolonialist character of their activities.

In the postwar period the rate of growth of capital export and trade among he industrial capitalist countries was greater than it was between them and he emerging nations. Direct international monopoly investments in the merging nations dropped in the sixties. Bourgeois and reformist thinkers have uggested that imperialism was over because it did not appear to depend in he main on capital export to colonies. It was supposed to have been replaced y "free" international investment and trade within the orbit of managed 'mixed" economies. However, "Imperialism in its basic essence does not hange but it is forced to operate in a changing world".[3]

There can be no doubting the fact that the developed capitalist countries till bank heavily on direct investments in the economies of emerging nations. At the end of the sixties, according to UN statistics, the emerging nations ccounted for approximately a third of the investments of 16 developed apitalist countries. The share is almost identical for US and West European MNC investments in Asian, African and Latin American developing countries. The Japanese international monopolies, however, have placed a much larger hare of their foreign investments (almost 3/5) in the developing areas of the vorld.

British, French, Dutch and Portuguese foreign investments hold a special place in Western Europe, for in the past these countries possessed large olonial territories and their MNC aim mostly at the developing world. In he case of Britain, still the second centre of capital export, the essential

colonial (now neocolonial) direction of capital export remained characteristic down to recent years. Just before 1914, nearly half of British foreign investments were in the colonies and dominions. From 1914 to 1970 more than half were in the area comprising the British Empire.

Furthemore, in search of strategic materials and superprofits, US monopoly capital did not neglect the less developed countries. US investments in Africa multiplied 4.4 times between 1960 and 1973 while private US investments in all the developing countries went from $11.1 billion to 27.9 billion. (*Statistical Abstract of the United States*, 1975, p. 801.) So, in absolute figures the export of capital to the developing countries did not decrease, but increased everywhere.

Statistics show that during the present fuel and raw material shortage the developing countries account for a large share of direct investments by the developed capitalist countries. In 1975, for example, the US oil corporations doubled their new investments and showed a 20 per cent increase of reinvestments despite the drop in rate of US export of capital because of the economic crisis and despite the restrictions enforced by several emerging nations. In other words, exploitation of the peoples of the emerging nations on a world scale remains one of capitalism's characteristic traits.

In dealing with the export of capital to the advanced and to the developing countries, *mention should be made of the enormously increased role of finance* capital. One of the means by which US, West European and Japanese finance capital extended its grip externally was by extending its banking network overseas, correspondent banks, subsidiary corporations and branch banks. The number of US bank branches overseas increased steadily between 1965-72 from 303 to 1,009. By 1973 British banks had 192 overseas branches, Japanese 145, West German—103 and French—91. (*Multinational Corporations in World Development*, p. 12.) This banking-capital expansion merged with the industrial expansion of the monopolies.

The international banking monopolies or multinational banks that appeared in the seventies were a new stage of concentration and centralisation of loans. There were two basic reasons prompting the formation of such banks: growing economic internationalisation and rapid expansion of MNC and the sharpening rivalry in the capitalist credit-banking system.

The operations of such giants as EBIC (European Banks International Company), ABECOR (Associated Banks of European Corporation), CCB (Commerzbank, Credit Lyonnais, Banco di Roma), Orion and the International Energy Bank show that the international banking monopolies were set up mainly for the convenience of the international industrial monopolies *not only as concerns banking operations, but also in repatterning spheres of* influence. The formation of these multinational banks is a sign that the structure of finance capital is growing and becoming more complex, thus creating new and worsening old forms of rivalry.

Capital export, we have established, is inseparable from the expansion of international industrial monopolies and banks and they play the leading role in the export of investment and loan capital. Let us examine certain aspects of foreign investments. But first, why the accelerated rate of capital export to the developed capitalist countries?

First of all, the science-technical revolution greatly extended the field of

profitable investments in the developed capitalist countries, one of the reasons for the sharp shift in the flow of capital balance in favour of US monopolies over the West European during two postwar decades. West European monopolies were in a position to launch their counter-offensive only in the middle sixties after accumulating a sufficiently large financial and technical potential. The other reason for the flow of capital to developed capitalist countries was the prospect of losing property as a result of nationalisation in emancipated countries.

Among the favourable conditions attracting capital to Western Europe, for example, is their more or less stable economic growth in the postwar years and the temporary success of state-monopoly capitalism. This growth, covering almost a quarter of a century, and nostalgically called the "long boom", provided fertile ground for fast accumulation. US capital export was a part cause of as well as being attracted by the "boom".

Another important factor in growth of capital export to developed capitalism is the quest for additional means of securing entry to the former colonial and dependent territories. "When a US corporation or a bank attains an interest in a West German, Japanese or French corporation, it also becomes a partner in their foreign colonial operations. (Gus Hall, *Imperialism Today*, p. 55.)

The activity of US monopoly capital in expanding its industrial and financial network has been furthered by the position of the US dollar as the major currency in the capitalist world. Using this advantage, US monopolies, increasing their direct investments, created a flood of investment dollars in the world's currency markets. This obviously caused a deficit in the US balance of payments and later was one of the factors stopping the free conversion of dollars into gold. A large part of the dollars circulating in the West European currency markets (the so-called Euro-dollar), together with the US banking network covering the entire capitalist world, let financial capital profit by financing the "boom" in the countries of Western Europe.

Another important side of capital export is the growing significance of direct foreign investments by which the international monopolies gain control over exploitation of overseas raw materials and labour. Capital export in the form of portfolio investments not allowing for such control has been relegated to the background.

Also, there are the many methods used to achieve neocolonialist goals. The collapse of the system of direct colonial rule has called for a new, more flexible strategy which would ensure monopoly capital's entry into the economies of developing countries and control over certain spheres of capital investments in these countries.

International capital is banking on the support of the bourgeoisie and ruling circles in certain emerging states and is striving to arouse their interests economically in co-operating with the monopolies. The sole aim is to keep the countries within the capitalist orbit and be able to exploit their raw materials. Also popular are the so-called mixed companies with the foreign monopolies attracting participation by local private and state capital. The international monopolies gain certain advantages from neocolonialist methods: local capital is centralised, support is ensured of multinational monopoly control of resources at lowest cost.

In other words, international monopoly capital continues exploiting the

developing countries, with the only difference that the crude methods of colonial days have given way to more refined neocolonialist economic methods of plunder.

Monopoly capital exploits not only the industrially poorly developed emerging nations, acquiring super-profits on the cheap labour and raw materials, but the comparatively industrialised emerging nations also. One effective way the monopolies pump profits out of these countries is by using the existing system of international division of labour and their own technological and economic superiority. Another sign of exploitation is the unfavourable foreign trade balance of the 50s and up to the present day when developing state-monopoly capitalism was accompanied by a neocolonialist policy.[4]

President Geisel of Brazil, visiting Britain in 1976, declared that he aimed to make Brazil a leading industrial country. However, for a more complete picture it should be added that one of the main features of the "Brazilian model" is the wide attraction of foreign capital. For this reason Brazil, occupying a special place in the monopolies' Latin American strategy, and in the "third world" in general, remains a client state of finance capital with an industry working mainly to pay the country's debt to the imperialist countries. Judging by 1977 appraisals, payment of interest on foreign loans will amount to $2.3 billion while debts will consume $3.6 billion. By the end of 1977 Brazil's foreign debt will total $25.8 billion against $22.6 billion in 1976 (*Financial Times*, January 14, 1977.) By comparison, Brazil's exports in 1976 amounted to $10.1 billion.

As for the developing countries as a whole, the export of profits made on investments more than doubled in the ten years 1960-70. This tendency, reports the UNCTAD secretariat, will continue and by 1980 the emerging countries will lose almost $25 billion.

Yet another means used by monopoly capital for pursuing its neocolonialist exploitation is to make use of world-wide capitalist economic organisations, specific to the period of state-monopoly capitalism, such as the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and the World Bank, etc. The IMF, for example, has been used as one means of stabilising the economies of "advanced" capitalist countries that get into balance of payments crises, as happened with Britain. It extends loans enabling these countries to resume their role in the world system of monopoly capitalism. The IMF has likewise been used to "stabilise" the economies of developing countries in the interests of neocolonialist exploitation. Such "stabilisation" is aimed at securing the payment of interest on loans and the remittance of profits on monopoly capital investments. Needless to say, loans on these conditions only serve to intensify exploitation, increase debt and interest payments.

An indication of the exploitation of the developing countries is their overall external debt. In 1965 it was $34 billion (more than four times the 1956 figures), and $89 billion in 1972. Interest payments increased accordingly from $2.7 billion in 1965 to $7.5 billion in 1972. (*World Bank Annual Report 1974*, Washington, pp. 85, 86, 91.) According to the World Bank, this external debt increased to $151.4 billion by 1975, while payments on loans were at $10 billion in 1975, and $12.5 billion in 1976. Clearly such "development" is a

sign of mounting exploitation of the emerging nations in the interests of finance capital.

World economic development in the seventies is characterised by the growing role of the oil-producing countries in large-scale export. The increase in oil prices by OPEC countries has sharply raised their incomes and accumulation of capital. And most of these countries cannot, as yet, economically assimilate this capital. Part was used by the OPEC countries to increase imports of commodities from the main capitalist countries, and for industrialisation. However, a large part of the income on oil was placed in West European and US banks, in Arabian multinational banks established with the help of the leading imperialist nations. The imperialist powers, apprehensive that with the continuing monetary crisis concentration of large sums of oil dollars in the oil-producing countries could cause another upheaval, took measures to channel this money back to their own economies, to start circulation of surplus oil capital and help ease the economic difficulties. The Eurodollar market, the international monetary market and international organisations played a big role in syphoning capital from OPEC countries back to the citadels of imperialism, thereby complicating the struggle of the emerging nations for economic independence.

The new multinational banking systems set up in the OPEC countries have the same goal. Through them the international banking monopolies hope to grasp control of the growing financial resources of the oil-producing countries making them available to the monopolies and relegating the oil countries to the state of nominal possessors of "oil money". So far the capitalist banking systems have successfully returned a large portion of the oil dollars to finance capital channels.

If before, the imperialists profited by the exploitation of raw material and labour resources of the oil-producing countries, today, they are persistently attempting to do the same through capitalisation of oil currency. The oil-producing countries, however, intend creating conditions to deal independently with their resources, and the balance of forces in the world today makes this a reality. Important in this respect are the loans and credits some emerging countries extend to other emerging countries, usually with no compensation.

Another aspect of this problem worthy of attention is that in 1974-76 certain oil-producing countries extended large credits to Britain, France, Italy, Japan and the FRG. This partnership between the developing oil-producing countries and the leading capitalist countries broadens the ties of international finance capital which exploits the labour of both sides. There was wide coverage in the press, for instance, of Japan's negotiations with several Mideast countries on oil deliveries in exchange for manufactured articles. This joint project would be financed by loans from finance capital which in turn, is refurbished by "oil money". Finance capital seems to be an independent force here controlling the manufacturing industry in both the developed and developing countries.

In examining finance capital operations it would be wrong to disregard the sharpening of contradictions between nationally-isolated imperialism and between developed capitalism and the emerging nations, the result of the new situation on the oil market. It would be equally wrong to ignore the fact that the price rise following the action of the OPEC countries is in opposition to

the immediate interests of the working class in imperialist countries, througl raising the cost of living. The bourgeois media immediately laid the blame oı the OPEC countries. But, in the long run, the working class in the imperialis countries, and this includes Great Britain, is fully aware of who is to blam and support the anti-imperialist struggle in the developing countries.

The role of the bourgeois states must be considered when examining inter national monopoly expansionism. State-monopoly control of capital export ha a large assortment of methods at its disposal, ranging from tax exemptions financial support, overseas investment guarantees and information services, t political support. Weaving its extensive neocolonialist network, monopol capital strives for state support in imperialist and in developing countries. Th state provides investments in the least profitable economic spheres of th receiving countries, say, the infrastructure, and helps the monopolies take i the required profits. A new trait in export of loans, an effective neocolonialis lever in itself, is the monopoly intention to saddle the state with the risk connected with foreign loans and credits. In state-monopoly capitalism, th state extends vitally important aid to the monopolies in their neocolonialis operations, also providing export capital and guaranteeing private investments

The relations of the state to monopoly capital have become subject to th growing need for a supportive role of the state. The alliance between th *bourgeois state and internationalised finance capital is contradictory.* How ever, individual states may, at times, pursue policies antagonistic to individua monopolies, in the interests of national capital as a whole. It appears wrong therefore, to regard the relationship as one dominated solely by the monopolies on the one hand, or solely by the state on the other. Rather, state-monopol capitalism is an entity which involves not a complete fusion, but unity i contradiction.

The situation differs in the emerging nations, where the bourgeoisie is no sufficiently strong and where the state plays the leading role either as obedien ally of the imperialist monopolies, or, on the contrary, employs an independen economic policy. The position of the state on domestic economic development the direction of overseas ties, its attitude towards national capital and th international monopolies, can undergo radical changes depending on th correlation of national and external class forces and the pressure applied to it

Apparently the period of rapid and relatively easy accumulation by state monopoly capitalism is over a possibly long period of much greater difficultie in maintaining its general rate of profit has begun, a period of deepenin cycles of over-production and increasingly endemic inflation. In these con ditions, it is to be expected that state-monopoly capitalism will turn to it tested means of increasing exploitation and attacking existing democrati rights. This will sharpen the class struggle.

Finance capital, dependent as before on neocolonialist exploitation, on th labour and materials and even on the industrialisation of the less develope countries, will apply itself more and more to linking the resources of th developing countries to the monopolies. As the general crisis of capitalisn deepens finance capital will take advantage of the uneven development o production, trade and investments in various countries in a bid to "spread it nets", as Lenin put it, and to turn to ever-new forms of neocolonialis exploitation. Sections of the ruling circles in the developing countries may i

some cases be lured into the spider's web of finance capital. The latter grows even faster, but it will outgrow its strength, brought down by its internal contradictions and by the conscious struggle of the peoples.

Crises in the capitalist world will deepen as the competition between the two world systems continues, as socialism progresses and strengthens its positions. The developing countries are also challenging imperialism. As they fight for a new economic order, supported by the USSR and the other socialist states, these countries threaten to undermine imperialist exploitation.

* * *

WMR plans to continue publication of articles analysing key features of present-day capitalism in the light of Lenin's theory of imperialism. The worsening general crisis of capitalism and its influence on the class struggle; national and international monopolies under the system of state-monopoly capitalism; state-monopoly regulation; finance capital and the credit system; the main centres of interimperialist rivalry; economic essence of neocolonialism detente and the capitalist economy, are among the subjects the articles will deal with.

---

[1] *Multinational Corporations in World Development*, UN, New York, 1973, p. 138.

[2] Gus Hall, *Imperialism Today*, New York, 1972, p. 49.

[3] Ibid., p. 53.

[4] In the period 1951-56 the developing countries had a favourable trade balance with the imperialist powers. In the five years 1957-62 it showed a deficit of $8.4 billion. In 1973 the overall export of the "third world' countries topped imports by $11.8 billion, and $21.1 billion in 1975. Without the oil-producing countries the unfavourable balance was $10 billion in 1973, $28.9 billion in 1974 and $37.9 billion in 1975. (*Monthly Bulletin of Statistics*, UN, November 1976, Vol. XXX, No. 11, pp. 110-111.)

New Co-operation Horizons

Round Table Discussion in Sofia

RECENT congresses of ruling Communist and Workers' parties emphasised the steady coming together of fraternal countries as a development law of world socialism. This is finding expression in closer co-operation of the parties, countries and peoples of the socialist community, more rapid formation of common elements in their economic, political, social, ideological and cultural structures. What we have is a qualitatively new development in socialist international relations, one that requires further Marxist-Leninist theoretical intepretation.

Many of the questions involved were examined at a recent conference in Sofia.[1] The *WMR* representatives attending it invited some of its participants to a Round Table discussion on the question: "What aspects of socialist co-operation are most characteristic of the present stage, and why?" The answers are given on this and the following pages.

Equalising Development Levels Through Integration

P. BOŻYK
Polish Economist

CLOSER socialist economic integration is a main aspect of the economic anc political processes in the socialist community. There is no need to dwell ir detail on the content and significance of this: these questions were dealt witł in the documents of the 25th CPSU Congress, the 7th PUWP Congress anc the congresses of other ruling fraternal parties; also in many Marxist studies including articles in this journal. I would like to deal with one aspect o: integration that has not only economic but also political implications, namely its influence on equalising socio-economic development levels in the socialis countries.

This, of course, is not easily achieved. For, as a result of historical con ditions, at the start of building the new society the main economic indicator: in some of our countries differed widely. But close, genuinely internationalis co-operation has gone a long way in solving the problem: integration injectec a new dimension. In the past, equalisation of development levels was mainly through quantitative approximation, by forming similar economic structures Today, the process is a qualitative one, i.e., the formation of specialisec economic structures complementing each other.

Internal factors were dominant in equalising development levels, and witł more effect in the less developed than in the more industrially developec countries. For the former had large reserves of manpower which could be relocated from one part of the economy (i.e., agriculture) to others (e.g., industry). There were also more favourable conditions for increasing social productivity, chiefly through restructuring the formation of national income. This was done by increasing the share of the more productive branches of the economy (e.g., industry) and reducing the share of the less productive (e.g., agriculture) and also by changing the structure of industry itself. Lastly, higher social productivity was facilitated by wider use of technology and more efficient operation.

External factors played an immense part too, the most important being scientific, technical, production and other assistance by the Soviet Union and other fraternal countries with higher industrial potentials.

Today most CMEA members largely follow one and the same national-income formation pattern and have similar industrial structures. The reserves mentioned above have declined considerably compared with the early postwar decades. I therefore believe that the further evening out of development levels is possible only through closer international economic co-operation and closer integration in the international socialist division of labour. What are the main advantages of this method?

First, by extending production specialisation within the framework of mutual division of labour, the socialist countries acquire additional opportunities to raise productivity, employ more progressive designing and technological methods and expand the more effective lines of production. This is facilitated also by other forms of international economic co-operation; for instance, joint investment in capital construction and production.

Second, specialisation allow the socialist countries to concentrate on selected

branches of science and technology. Naturally, this should be attended by their comprehensive scientific and technical co-operation which, in the final analysis, raises the scientific and technical potential of each socialist country and of the community as a whole.

And so, briefly stated, this is my idea: if in the initial stage equalisation was the result of bringing production structures of the less developed countries closer to those of the more developed, today it is increasingly the result of differentiation of the production structure within a given industry. And this means that the decisive condition for continued equalisation of social-economic development levels lies through socialist economic integration and closer mutual division of labour.

Strategic Approach

O. T. BOGOMOLOV

Corresponding Member, USSR Academy of Sciences,
and Director of the Institute of the Economy of the Socialist World System

I AGREE with Comrade Bożyk that closer socialist economic integration is today the key element in developing relations between our fraternal countries. And this yields not only economic, but also political, social and ideological results which perhaps we cannot yet fully appreciate. My Polish colleague analysed one of these results. I would like to draw attention to the problems facing our parties and countries in intensifying the very process of integration.

It is no exaggeration to say, I think, that last year's 30th CMEA session adopted a very important decision that ushered in a new stage in our planning co-operation. I have in mind the framing of long-term special-purpose programmes of economic co-operation designed to pool our efforts to meet the rapidly growing demand for energy, fuel, basic raw materials, secure fuller satisfaction of the demand for food and manufactured consumer goods, raise the level of our engineering industry and accelerate the development of transport. This will give our countries an effective integration lever that will raise the whole system of co-operation to a higher plane.

What are the grounds for that view? First, the programmes are designed to solve the biggest and most complex problems of CMEA's economic development. They lay more stress on the strategic (long-range) systems and multiform approach to these problems, thereby making it possible to eliminate bottlenecks and certain restrictive features in bilateral co-ordination of five-year plans. But, of course, if the programmes are to play their full role, we shall have to resolve a number of complex theoretical and practical questions.

The programmes will deal not with national five-year plans, but with our countries' long-range scientifico-technical and socio-economic development. This makes them special international planning documents which take into account national and world-wide forecasts and the general socio-economic strategy of each fraternal country.

So far our economic co-operation, even in such effective form as joint construction projects, has as a rule provided solutions for only individual problems, without at the same time accomplishing large-scale comprehensive tasks involving several industries. In this respect the long-range special-purpose programmes are a big step forward. Their underlying idea is, first, com-

prehensive co-ordination in the fulfilment of interconnected tasks, and, seconc concentration on the central, key economic problems that form the backbon *of these programmes.*

One of the crucial questions in drafting and operating these programmes is I think, defining the size and financing of the necessary capital outlays. Fo the existence of national, special-purpose programmes sometimes syphon away resources from economic branches not envisaged in the programme thus disturbing the balanced development of the economy. Financing inter national projects will require, in my opinion, new forms of co-operation i capital investment and just distribution of the loads carried by each of th participating countries. We would be taking a one-sided, narrow approach i we were to reduce such co-operation merely to participation in investments, th potentialities of which are limited. What we need are such forms of co-opera tion as co-ordinated national investment programmes, co-ordinated construc tion of interconnected production capacities in the participating countrie construction of joint enterprises in CMEA or third countries.

I would also draw attention to this important circumstance: the need t manoeuvre financial and credit funds within CMEA to assure their effectiv utilisation in carrying out the programmes. This, I think, might necessitat formation of national material and financial resources funds, also collectiv investment funds made up of contributions from the participating countrie and the organisation of jointly-run economic partnership amalgamations.

To sum up, long-range special-purpose programmes will have the definit aim of undertaking cardinal national and international projects, with desig nated schedules and executors and backed by the necessary resources. Thi presupposes further concretisation, complemented by appropriate programme and measures to ensure co-operation at ministry, amalgamation and enterpris level.

And, of course, these programmes call for intensified international co-opera tion between the various industries and the development of organisation forms of managing the processes of socialist economic integration.

More Active Ideological Co-operation

L. NOVOTNY

Director, CC CPCz Institute of Marxism-Leninism

PREVIOUS speakers have dealt mainly with processes taking place in th basis of socialist society. But I think it is very important to intensify ideo logical co-operation between our parties and countries, which has bee especially noticeable in the past three or four years.

Party workers and scholars in our countries are discussing whether or not i is right to speak of integration processes in the superstructure, particularly i ideology. But whatever approach we take, there is the irrefutable fact tha ideological and cultural ties between members of the socialist community between our parties, are rapidly growing in scope and depth. This is largel attributable to the conferences of Central Committee secretaries of the rulin fraternal parties on international and ideological questions.

Our Sofia conference demonstrated the substantial expansion of ideologica co-operation. And it is important to note that its quantitative growth, broade

contacts, has been attended by qualitative changes. The most important of these, in my view, is that ideological links between our parties—both bilateral and multilateral—are assuming a more systematic and long-range character and are oriented on the pivotal problems of ideological education and the ideological struggle. We now have an effective mechanism of ideological co-operation. It encompasses practically every branch of ideological education, theoretical and propaganda work. Different methods are employed. For instance, regular meetings of Party functionaries dealing with ideological matters to exchange experience in the mass media, education, co-ordination of publishing activity, etc.

I would like to make some suggestions on a subject in which I have a close interest, namely, improving contacts in the social sciences.

Much has been accomplished in this respect. Party research and educational institutions, Academy of Sciences institutes in the humanities, other research and educational establishments, theoretical journals, are more closely co-ordinating their activities, exchanging information and working on joint projects. Bilateral and multilateral commissions of social scientists on selected problems have done much useful work. Conferences of Academies of Sciences Vice-presidents in charge of social science play an important part in co-ordinating joint research on the principal theoretical problems that arise in communist and socialist construction and the changing world situation.

As examples of such fruitful multilateral co-operation I might cite the following: "Contemporary Right Revisionism, a Critical Analysis" (1973) and "The Social Philosophy of the Frankfurt School" (1975) compiled by philosophers of Czechoslovakia and the Soviet Union, "Socialism and the Nation" (1975), a collective study by scholars of Bulgaria, Hungary, the German Democratic Republic, Mongolia, Poland, Vietnam, Rumania, the USSR, Czechoslovakia. I wish to avail myself of this occasion to mention the valuable contribution to multinational theoretical co-operation of Marxists-Leninists made by the conferences, symposia, round-table discussions, research groups and seminars organised by *World Marxist Review*.

And yet I am inclined to the view that the present level of co-operation of the socialist countries in the social sciences does not fully meet our requirements.

In accordance with the decisions of our Party congresses, it would be a good idea to draw up a concrete long-range programme of ideologico-theoretical co-operation for research on the more complex and topical problems of developing socialism, the world revolutionary process, and the ideological struggle. And provision could be made for regular meetings of Party workers, ideologists and scholars for reciprocal acquaintance and generalisation of the experience accumulated by the ruling parties in the socialist countries in communist education, popularisation of the achievements of existing socialism and the socialist way of life.

Of the theoretical problems the more topical, I think, are those associated with the study of the laws governing socialist and communist construction and the emergence and development of the community of socialist states. I also feel we should more closely pool our efforts in generalising the international experience of socialist construction and its influence on the world revolutionary process; the dialectics of the national and the international interests of the

nationalism, the essence of socialist international relations and their influence on world development; the processes of the coming together of the socialist community countries; socialist economic integration, and a number of other problems.

Works on the history of existing socialism would be of inestimable value in studying these problems and in the practical ideological activity of our parties.

In conclusion, I would like to deal with some practical questions of co-operation in this field. And the more important of these is selection of, and concentration on, focal problems. The time is ripe, I feel, for devising a system of planning and organisation of comprehensive international research in the social sciences. In this context, we could draw on the experience of CMEA, with due account, of course, to the essential differences between ideological and scientifico-technical co-operation. We should also give thought to organising, at some future date, institutions to study especially important and complex problems.

Internationalisation of Experience

A. NYAMA
Mongolian philosopher

I AM in complete agreement with Comrade Novotny on the need to deepen ideological co-operation of the fraternal parties as a major element in the development of socialism. We know that similar processes are taking place in other fields—the natural sciences, schools, higher education, culture and also the exchange of opinions between our parties on current and more fundamental problems of building socialism and communism and on contemporary world development.

We can thus speak of more intensive internationalisation and collective generalisation of the experience accumulated by the ruling fraternal parties in socialist and communist construction and in promoting socialist-type international relations.

At the same time, I would emphasise the very special value and international significance of the experience of building the new society in the USSR. For the Soviet people, led by their Leninist Party, were the first to launch on building of socialism, the first to build a developed socialist society, and the first to undertake the building of communism. In accomplishing these momentous tasks the CPSU has built up a fund of experience, of which the main features are of international significance and are expressive of the principles without which there can be no socialism.

For many years Soviet experience was of unique importance and helped the young states avoid a number of mistakes in building socialism. True, in the early years attempts mechanically to copy this experience, plus underestimation of national specifics led to certain shortcomings and difficulties in these countries. But they were successfully overcome, and precisely because the parties drew on the generally applicable, universal features of Soviet experience and creatively applied them in their own countries.

Today the ruling fraternal parties can draw on an incomparably richer fund of experience in socialist construction. But I think that this in no way detracts

Soviet state. More, the value of that experience is increasing, due to two factors. First, the CPSU and the Soviet Union are now, too, the trailblazers of the new, higher stages of socialist society and, consequently, have experience in solving the problems this poses. One example is the CPSU's outstanding contribution to the theory and practice of building developed socialism. Second, today, with the socialist countries steadily coming closer together, and with the more pronounced identity of their social, political and economic structures, they are faced with increasingly identical problems, and this adds to the value of CPSU experience. This second factor, in my view, is the main reason why our parties are paying more attention to the internationalisation of experience and closer co-operation in this field.

The example and experience of the CPSU and the Soviet Union is exerting a powerful influence on the world revolutionary process, on the whole contemporary world. That is why the reactionaries are stepping up their attacks on the USSR and are doing everything to discredit and vilify its role and minimise the value of its experience. In my opinion, anti-Sovietism is the most dangerous variety of anti-communism in the present-day ideological struggle.

Enhancing the value of international experience raises several problems.

One of these is selecting the main subjects our parties should concentrate on in generalising their collective experience. I think that there are two such subjects. First, the study of the coming-together process. There is evidence that it does not develop along a straight line and poses a wide range of theoretical and practical problems, which, I think, should be the subject of joint close study. Second, the problems involved in the building of developed socialist society. As distinct from the first subject, much has been done here by scholars from the various countries and by international research collectives. But so far there is no fundamental work generalising the wealth of experience in building developed socialism in all its multiformity and comprehensiveness. I think that the preconditions for such a fundamental study exist and the need for it, both from the theoretical and practical standpoint, is great.

---

[1] A brief report appeared in our February issue.

The Lessons of Chile
Fourth Article[1]

Roads of Revolution

JORGE INSUZA
Political Commission member, Communist Party of Chile

THE revolutionary process in Chile is the first prolonged experiment in the peaceful development of revolution. The international Communist movement regards it as an event whose analysis could contribute significantly to perfecting revolutionary strategy and tactics. Study of the class struggle in this period yields conclusions that enrich the theory of the development of revolution by peaceful means, show exactly how limited these means are, and how relevant is the Marxist-Leninist proposition on ability to use all forms of struggle.

For us Chilean Communists a precise assessment of the process as a whole with an analysis of its victories and failures is essential to the success of our efforts both now and in the future. This task, to which attention was drawn immediately after the coup, is still as important as ever.

Our experience confirms that the roads of revolution—peaceful and non-peaceful—cannot and should not be regarded as mutually exclusive. Treating them as opposite poles is dangerous to the whole revolutionary process.

Marx, speaking for the revolutionary workers, warned the reactionaries: ". . . We shall act against you peacefully where it is possible for us to do so, and by force of arms when that becomes necessary." This definition of tactics has lost none of its significance today. A striking example of such an approach to development of the revolutionary process, when the different roads to power and its consolidation are considered in their dialectical unity, was Lenin's conception, put into practice in 1917. In April of that year he pointed to the possibility of the peaceful development of the revolution; after the July events he spoke of the necessity of preparing for an armed uprising; in September he again considered peaceful development possible and called for efforts to realise this possibility; and finally, only a little later he drew the conclusion that there must be an armed uprising, which in fact led to the victory of October.

Our Party's interest in the problem of the peaceful development of the revolution goes back a long way. In the 1960s we made a deeper study of these problems, using the conclusions drawn from past experience to work out and creatively apply the Marxist propositions on the peaceful transition to socialism. Our notion of how this road should actually be travelled in Chile was gradually perfected on the basis of the general laws of revolution and the country's national peculiarities. The Communists proposed that the working class should become a rallying point for the majority, for all the anti-imperialist and anti-oligarchic forces, so that a government capable of effecting the revolutionary changes necessitated by the mounting crisis of Chilean society could be formed. The aim was to carry out an anti-imperialist, anti-

monopoly and agrarian revolution with the long-term goal of moving on towards socialism. Having established two strategic stages of the revolution, we planned to put them into effect as a single unbroken, revolutionary process. This possibility rested on the objective interconnection between the goals of the two stages, and also on the leading role which the working class could and should undertake in a broad alliance with the forces interested in change. Our Party pointed out that the revolutionary crisis was imminent and at the same time noted the combination of objective, subjective, national and international factors that would allow the people of Chile to gain power without the use of armed force as the chief means of struggle. This gave a powerful impetus to the development of the mass movement and greater scope for rallying the majority of the population around the working class.

The Party had to explain its plans. It had to defend them from numerous attacks and overcome misunderstanding. The revolutionary character of this road was proved both in theory and practice. To avoid any misunderstandings a precise definition of the word "peaceful" was given. Peaceful development of the process did not mean that the struggle of the people's movement should proceed only within the framework of bourgeois legal forms; nor was it necessarily, let alone exclusively, to be associated with electioneering. The peaceful road (we also called it the "unarmed" road) did not, and could not, mean total repudiation of the use of force for removing the reactionary classes from power. A revolution, as we realised, always entails force and social coercion, although it does not always assume armed forms.

In all the documents of our Party it was noted that the choice of road did not depend only on the subjective decision of the revolutionaries. Changes in the situation should be foreseen and prepared for in advance. This idea is clearly expressed in our 1969 programme. Whereas, previously, the stress was laid on the possibility of peaceful development of the revolution, now, as Luis Corvalan said at the 14th National Congress of the Communist Party of Chile, "the new programme declares that revolution is a complex process comprising all forms of the struggle that our people are waging, and that *its roads are determined according to the historical situation, but must invariably be based on the activity of the masses.*

"In view of this the revolutionary solution should not necessarily be linked in advance with any one definite road."

This assessment was not associated with any change of the tactics we had adopted, but was a result of their better elaboration.

In the light of our experience it can be seen that a deeper study of the concepts of the "peaceful" and "armed" roads must be made, that they must be stripped of all ambiguity, that we must realise that they belong not to the sphere of strategy but to that of tactics, which changes according to circumstances. The political line must be analysed and checked from the standpoint of the interconnection and dialectical unity of its components. As I have noted above, our view on this point of dialectics was made more precise. But a tendency to absolutise the peaceful road still persisted. We sometimes referred to it as "the natural channel", and the correct proposition that it would be necessary at a certain stage to follow "only one line" was taken by many people as meaning that the road we were following at the given moment would be that one line.

Lenin said that a revolutionary party should be able to command all forms of struggle. He emphasised, however, that one should not confuse "fundamental recognition, *in principle*, of all means of struggle, of all plans and methods, provided they are expedient, with the demand *at a given political moment* to be guided by a strictly observed plan . . ." (*Coll. Works*, Vol. 5, p. 391).

When you are in the thick of the fight it is not always easy to reach a practical decision. You have to take into account what forms of struggle are dictated by the objective situation. Lenin noted this in his day and it came out very plainly in the Chilean events.

"Every form of struggle requires a corresponding technique and a corresponding apparatus," Lenin emphasised. "When objective conditions make the parliamentary struggle the principal form of struggle, the features of the apparatus for parliamentary struggle inevitably become more marked in the Party" (Vol. 11, p. 354). Intensification of such features is dangerous in the sense that it can hamper the skilful change of tactics that a change in the situation demands, and this danger can be diminished only by very attentive and thoughtful action by the leadership and the whole Party. We were thoughtful and attentive, but this was not enough.

Despite some oversights, the basic theoretical propositions of a strategical and partially tactical character evolved by the Party helped to mobilise the broad masses in the fight for revolutionary goals. The conditions that brought the developing revolutionary situation to a head were created mainly by unarmed means. Practice showed that a political line which correctly defined the main enemies and the direction of the main blow put the main emphasis on development of the mass struggle, and was geared to the pre-election situation, could lead to victory. Following this line through stubborn class battles in all spheres of social activity enabled the Popular Unity alliance to win the post of President of the Republic. The victory of 1970 gave the revolutionary government access to power (or rather partial power) with the help of the bourgeois electoral machinery and the laws of bourgeois democracy. Lenin's theory of revolution thus became reality.

Does this mean that the reverses that followed prove the impossibility of carrying out a revolution by peaceful means (as the ideologues of the big and petty bourgeoisie are now saying)? A genuinely scientific analysis certainly does not warrant this conclusion. At the same time, in analysing the situation we see what steps should have been taken but were not taken or not taken energetically and resolutely enough to exploit the advantage already gained by peaceful means.

The following general conclusion may also be drawn. The peaceful development of revolution is a process that is completed only when the question of power is finally decided, when the possibility of restoration of the power of the old classes has been ruled out, and the new democracy and new leadership of society have been firmly established. Certain phases can be defined in this process. The popular forces' winning of power (at first only partial power) completes the first phase. Then comes the period of solving the "second-day" problems—the assertion of the revolutionary gains and the consolidation of forces, when the question on the agenda is "Who will win?" The general preconditions for victory in both phases exist, but the pressure on the revolu

tionary movement in each differs. And reaction may be so fierce that it imposes the need for use of revolutionary armed force. This means that the revolutionary process in the second phase must follow a different course from what it did in the first. But, on the one hand, this does not cancel the first step, the first victory and, on the other, reaction's chances of provoking civil war are diminished if the revolutionaries do their work well.

The experience of Chile up to 1970 and for a certain time afterwards suggests that the peaceful development of the revolutionary process is the most acceptable road, if there is the opportunity and, of course, only while that opportunity exists. In a revolutionary situation only the absence of conditions for the peaceful development of the revolution or their having been whittled down, makes it possible and imperative to take the road of armed struggle.

The possibilities of developing the revolution by peaceful means in present-day conditions are closely linked with the substantial changes that have taken place in the world since the victory of the Great October Socialist Revolution. The growing prestige of the socialist countries makes these possibilities more and more realistic. It is becoming increasingly difficult for imperialism to export counter-revolution, to engage in direct armed intervention that has to be answered by the use of armed revolutionary force. The victory of the Vietnam revolution, which struck a serious blow at the export of counter-revolution, is a symbol of our times. This is also true of the victory in Cuba, which showed, apart from anything else, that these are situations in which imperialism cannot intervene successfully with its own forces. And although both revolutions involved a fierce armed struggle, they nevertheless confirm that the existence of international preconditions offer revolution a peaceful road in cases where the international factors combine with the national.

The Chilean events also reaffirmed the fact that the influence of international factors depends largely on the position taken by the political leaders of the revolutionary process, on their ability to use these factors as a lever, on their attitude to the support that the socialist countries are quite prepared to offer the progressive movement without any strings attached.

Some groups stress the difficulties of the peaceful transition arising from the domination of imperialism in Latin America. They focus attention on the ferocity with which imperialism defends its "strategic reserve". To this they add the argument that geographical position is a factor of political significance. Here we are certainly dealing with real facts, but they can be compensated, and more than compensated, if the revolutionary movements are firmly orientated on support from the forces of existing socialism and proletarian solidarity. This is an extremely important question of principle and practice. It is not isolation from the socialist countries but, on the contrary, strengthening of ties with them that improves the chances of success on the peaceful road, or, come to that, any success at all for the revolution, no matter what road it takes.

The new international situation is one of the main justifications for the general assertion that today peaceful revolution stands a better chance. However, the improvement of the balance of world forces does not imply the conclusion that this road must always be followed in all circumstances. The real possibilities of success on this road, possibilities that in the past were regarded as extremely thin, are now somewhat better.

On the other hand, the Chilean experience shows that imperialism has adapted its tactics to the new world conditions and evolved a practical alternative to direct armed intervention as a means of terminating the revolutionary process. We have in mind action in the sphere of economics, international relations, ideology, the armed forces, and so on. Chile offers a wealth of material for studying these methods. Their detailed analysis is beyond the scope of this article, but it should be noted that the success the revolutionaries have in combating these methods is linked with the question of their close co-operation with the socialist countries, their reliance on international solidarity—which was something that we did not have enough of.

Given a close interlocking of international and national factors, the key to the success of the revolutionary process undoubtedly lies with the internal factors. In Chilean conditions the revolution was based on the winning of a solid majority united around the working class. As we know, the victory at the 1970 elections that made it possible to form the Popular Unity government had the support not of an absolute majority, but of only 36 per cent of the voters. The government took up its duties after an intense class struggle that lasted for two months. During this struggle the Popular Unity alliance was able to thwart imperialism's first secret operation, which ended in an unsuccessful attempt at a coup d'etat. Popular Unity won over the majority of the public and forced the class enemy on to the defensive. Without this there would have been no respect for the results of the elections and the struggle for power could not have been won.

So, we have a factual basis for regarding the victory in the elections as a step that was of great importance but was not a sufficient guarantee that the oligarchy and imperialism, which still had dominant positions in society, would respect the expression of the people's will. We believe that the gains of Popular Unity were determined not just by the victory in the elections, but by the struggle before and after the elections.

Whereas the basic condition for the initial victory was the creation of a tested and effective majority for the achievement of immediate goals, the decisive condition for completion of the process was expansion of this majority, its consolidation and activation. Comrade Luis Corvalan wrote at the time: "The priority task now is to strengthen unity of the people, which could and should become an invincible force in advancing the Chilean revolution and the interests of various classes and sections of the population, isolating reaction, thwarting its subversive plans, preventing foreign interference, rebuffing imperialist pressure and building up wide support for the government.

"That is a crucial task, and it has to be accomplished in the very near future."

Action should have been taken to change the unstable, indecisive balance of forces in favour of the people and make it decisive. Use should have been made of the positions of power already gained, and the required government measures should have been carried out from these positions. This was an essential condition for consolidation of real people's power, for the victorious completion of the democratic revolution and a swift transition to the socialist revolution. This was the main condition for achieving revolutionary goals by peaceful means, for preventing reactionary violence.

Undoubtedly, the key problem, as we have already noted, was to achieve

monolithic working-class unity and gather round it, under its leadership, a strong alliance of the intermediate sections of the population, above all the peasants, and also the broad middle strata of the urban population, which in Chile have considerable social weight, while at the same time neutralising the national bourgeoisie. The intermediate strata, as we know, are between two poles, the revolutionary and counter-revolutionary, and have a tendency—first, economic, then political and ideological—to waver between these poles. The counter-revolutionary pole of Chilean society is represented by the financial and land-owning oligarchies and imperialism, and to ensure victory the working class had to do everything possible to isolate them. It had a very wide circle of essential and possible allies. But this opportunity was not used to the full. On the contrary, as the revolution proceeded the working class became noticeably isolated, particularly at the time of the coup, and this isolation was, in fact, the chief factor in its defeat. Not that the working class failed to acquire powerful allies, but it fell far short of taking in a wide enough circle to secure its victory.

Formidable battles were fought over this crucial question in the three years of the Popular Unity government's activity. The leftist elements played an extremely negative role from the standpoint of working-class interests. Their incorrect actions, which came from mistaken notions of the character of the Chilean revolution and were widely exploited by imperialism and the reactionaries, aroused first anxiety and then panic among the broad intermediate strata.

Obviously, one can win over the majority of the people only when tasks are set that have really become relevant to the given stage of the revolution and the given political situation. This means finding the key to each stage and taking a responsible stand on the conclusions drawn. At the same time the working class can become a focus of unity and spread its influence to the intermediate strata if, in conducting its general political line, it is able to undertake the defence not only of its own interests but also the essential interests of these social strata and develop its own revolutionary momentum. These are the principles on which government policy and the forces of Popular Unity should have worked to win over allies, consolidate the alliance and at the same time prevent reaction from influencing the strata that both sides wanted to win over.

Analysing events from this standpoint we can see that along with considerable, truly historic achievements, such as nationalisation of the major copper mines, agrarian reform, creation of a state-owned sector in the economy there were also clear weaknesses in the Chilean revolutionary process. A host of complex problems had to be dealt with in the unusual situation created by the imperialist economic blockade. This meant that even the revolutionary changes that had been carried through could not be exploited to the extent that circumstances required. The disunity in the leadership of the political alliance led to right and "left" deviations. There were failures in the drive for real democracy that should have united those forces that had an objective interest in change. Reactionary schemes were not always countered. On the contrary, they were actively promoted by the press, most of which was under reactionary control, and with the help of the press the government and the popular movement were attacked with a viciousness unusual in Chile. All

these factors hindered consolidation of the majority.

But winning over the majority was not enough. The power of the majority had to be used to gain the upper hand over the enemy in all spheres. As Lenin wrote: ". . . in time or revolution it is not enough to ascertain the 'will of the majority'—you must *prove to be stronger* at the decisive moment and in the decisive place; you must *win*" (Vol. 25, p. 201). The revolution must be able to defend itself. The main weapon in this defence is the new state that the revolution must create. In the context of peaceful transition this gives rise to some very complex problems, which again reveal the dialectical unity of the possible roads of revolution.

The development of the Chilean revolutionary process along the peaceful road, as has already been noted, gave the popular movement partial power. This success proved, on the one hand, the strength of the popular movement and, on the other, its inability at that moment to win full state power.

There is no reason to believe that such a situation is bound to repeat itself in any revolution developing on peaceful lines. In principle, it is possible "on the very first day" to capture all the commanding heights or at least all the civil authorities in the government apparatus (executive and legislative). But this will still be the old state apparatus and in all probability there will be within it and almost surely outside it organs of power that are not controlled by the revolution. The whole apparatus, as experience has shown, will be highly reluctant to carry out transformations and apply the coercion that is needed in such cases, until substantial changes have been made in its content and form. The decisive factor is the deep-going democratisation of the state apparatus, the creation of mechanisms instituting genuine popular control over the functioning of the state, and transfer of as many as possible of its powers to the masses. The positive experience gained in this field, for example, in the control of supply, the distribution and pricing of staple goods, offers a convincing picture of the possibilities in this sphere. Control "from below", from the masses, allows them to realise their power in practice and promote essential changes in the state apparatus from outside, changes that are effected with the assistance of the revolutionary leadership from within.

One of the aspects of this problem, as has already been suggested in other articles in this series, is connected with observance of bourgeois legality, which made it possible to win power in the first place. This problem loomed particularly large in Chile precisely because the popular movement had won only executive power, while its adversaries had retained strong positions in other organs of state power: parliament, the judiciary, the inspectorates, and so on. This unique situation created barriers to the passage of the new laws that were needed to consolidate real democratisation and revolutionary reforms. On the basis of our own experience, however, we can draw the conclusion that, thanks to the democratic gains that were achieved by the working class and the people in the course of the whole preceding struggle and that are one of the major factors in ensuring the peaceful development of the revolution, the revolutionaries can, by working from their position in the state bodies make very effective use of existing legislation. The use of the legal machinery must, of course, be combined with active campaigning on the part of the masses. Nationalisation of the big monopolies proved the existence of such possibilities.

When all this has been said, however, our experience indicates that the struggle of the masses, even under a popular government, cannot be restricted to the very narrow limits of the previous legislation because there is no room within this framework for all the revolutionary activity that is needed.

This leads us to the conclusion that there must be a unitary organisation embodying the people's power that has been generated "from below". Attempts to solve this problem were begun more or less spontaneously in Chile. From the experiment in setting up councils on supply and prices we moved on to setting up other bodies bringing together representatives of the masses. But this process did not culminate in the formation of new organs of state power. At the same time we do not hold that some special organisation has to be set up. In many countries, probably, one of the existing organisations could become the required organ of state power. As Lenin observed in his day: "The proletariat has approached, and will approach this singular task in different ways." Analysing the actual situation at the time, he went on: "In some parts of Russia the February-March Revolution puts nearly complete power in its hands. In others the proletariat may, perhaps, in a 'usurpatory' manner, begin to form and develop a proletarian militia. In still others, it will probably strive for immediate elections of urban and rural local government bodies on the basis of universal, etc., suffrage, in order to turn them into revolutionary centres . . ." (Vol. 23, p. 331).

The main thing, then, is to see to it that people can express their will and effectively exercise power "from below", that they take a direct part in building the new democracy. Without this the "power at the top" cannot carry out its revolutionary tasks in the face of the embittered opposition of the reactionaries.

In Chile mistakes were made in this respect. There was not enough clarity and unity among the revolutionaries regarding the type of state that had to be created, or the form and content of democracy. This vagueness led to hesitations that were expressed both in repudiation of the need for any dictatorship (which inevitably weakened the campaign for transformation of the bourgeois state), and in the urge to immediately set up proletarian dictatorship, for which at that moment the right conditions were lacking, and which would have meant a leap into a vacuum and would have led to the isolation of the working class .This lack of clarity created a kind of anarchy, because weakness in revolutionary theory means weakness of the subjective factor, of any guiding influence upon the efforts of the masses to strengthen the people's government.

The successful completion of any revolutionary path is bound to entail solving the specific problem of building up a favourable balance of armed forces. The elements of tactics evolved by Marx, Engels and Lenin are well known. We have in mind their statements referring mainly to the road of armed struggle. Without going into a detailed analysis, however, it can be said that all these elements should also be taken into account in evolving a conception of the revolution on peaceful lines. This kind of development does not presuppose an armed uprising or civil war, but care must be taken to achieve a balance of forces favourable to the revolution, and precisely for the purpose of preventing the reactionaries from unleashing armed conflict.

It is clear that one of the crucial factors is the situation in the armed forces

and the forces for maintaining public order. How did we in Chile approach this problem?

During the first stage, right up to its victorious conclusion in 1970, we tried to arrange matters so that the armed forces would not act against the popular movement, and thus to create conditions in which a reactionary putsch would be impossible. In doing so we relied on the tradition that the armed forces did not interfere in party policites (a line they had more or less observed for about forty years), and on the forces within the army that were loyal to the constitution and were oriented towards recognition of the popular victory achieved at the polls.

We stressed the fact that the Chilean armed forces were not *directly* connected with the big monopolies, that the officers came mainly from the middle strata, who had themselves experienced the effects of the crisis, that the junior officers, NCOs and rank and file came from the working class or the peasantry, from the poorest sections of the population. We said that the armed forces could not therefore remain indifferent to the process of transformation

At the same time we pointed out that the deepening of the crisis created a new situation. "It has become a reality, for instance, that the armed forces are a new factor in national politics. It may be said that the period of the non-participation of the armed forces in political life, a non-participation that was never absolute, has ended or is nearing its end." (Luis Corvalan, *Camino de Victoria*, p. 315.) And he added: "Of course, one must take into account the conditions in which the armed forces were built up, and particularly the fact that in the recent decades their professional training has experienced the influence of the Pentagon" (ibid., p. 425).

It may, I think, be asserted that the basic orientation on securing first and foremost non-interference by the armed forces, what we called their "neutralisation", was correct, just as it was correct for us to base ourselves on certain existing democratic traditions and consideration of the class composition of the armed forces. We see clearly now, however, that this was totally insufficient, in addition to which our policy in this field was based on certain theoretically unfounded assumptions.

For example, we regarded the armed forces' "professionalism" as something valuable, something on which one could rely in trying to prevent anti-popular action. In reality, this feature does nothing whatever to strengthen progressive positions in the armed forces. On the contrary, it tends to make them even more isolated from the people and their problems. Its encouragement creates a habit of mind that puts professionalism above everything else and takes the place of the class attitudes that are determined by the soldier's social origin.

The Chilean experience has shown that while "neutralisation" was necessary and sufficient as a first step, for getting the Popular Unity government into power, the completion of the revolutionary process makes demands of a different order. Neutralisation is a passing phase. It cannot by its very nature be anything else. As time goes on, the contradiction is bound to be resolved in one direction or another—for revolution or for counter-revolution. So, in the course of the process a solution must be found to the question of winning the armed forces over to the people's side by thoroughly democratising them, and this can only be done as a result of a very bitter confrontation on all fronts.

Here the dialectic that Marx discovered between revolution and counter-revolution is revealed to the full. The demands upon the revolution increase as it goes ahead, because the revolution must go on right up to the point when it becomes irreversible, and as it consolidates its positions it evokes increasingly furious opposition from the counter-revolutionary forces. Consequently, things that sufficed during the first stages do not suffice later on.

Experience shows that persistent efforts must be made to transform the armed forces, using all the acceptable means. The chief method, we repeat, is thorough democratisation with the help of the growing influence exerted on the armed forces by the working class and the people. Certain steps were taken in this direction. To some extent the process of drawing the military into the drive to transform the country was achieved, and this helped to bring them into closer contact with the people and give them an understanding of the people's problems. Some patriotically-minded regular servicemen gave a good account of themselves in the state apparatus; in the complex situation in October 1972, for example, during the counter-revolutionary attempt, it was the alliance of the popular movement with the patriotic sections of the armed forces that ensured the people's victory. Moreover, it must be admitted that the shortcomings in this field were not caused by any constitutional restrictions, but were due to the political oversight of the revolutionary forces. Here, too, the leftist sectarian element played a negative role.

During that period we stated: "The military establishments too, needs change, but that change should not be imposed on it. It must be initiated by the military, as a matter of their own conviction." This assertion obviously does not take into account all aspects of the problem. To achieve change, it is not enough to take action within the army alone. There must also be a struggle for the armed forces coming from outside. It must be waged by suitable means both in the context of armed revolutionary struggle and in the context of peaceful revolutionary development. As the Vietnamese military strategist, Vo Nguyen Giap, said, the essence of the law of revolutionary force lies in the combination of political forces with armed forces. This is applicable to any revolutionary road.

As already noted, we did achieve some successes on this road. But we did not do all that we needed to do or all that we could have done. We did not succeed in winning over the army to the people's side, or in ensuring a favourable balance of military forces in other respects. And when the balance of political forces was upset this position led to a crisis.

If we consider only the *result* of our experience, it may be asserted, as some people do, that we are discussing an insoluble problem, that an armed conflict is always inevitable. On the other hand, if we examine the development of our revolution *as a whole*, the conclusion is different: the problem can be solved in conditions when the revolutionary process is following a basically peaceful path, and the better the revolutionary movement is prepared to defend its gains in all fields, the more likely it is to be solved.

The Chilean revolution has suffered a temporary defeat. This does not mean, however, that there is nothing left of the successes achieved thanks to the people's government, that great historic creation of our people. The efforts of reaction to deny them have yielded no results. The contrast between past and present is so striking that many of those who only yesterday stood aloof from

the popular movement, or even acted against it, are today becoming ever more convinced of the need for unity with that movement. The critical analysis of the Chilean events and fair assessment of the great advances made by the masses in that period also encourage unity. The Party's policy is maturing on the basis of a profound assimilation of the lessons of the past, which will enable it to overcome present difficulties and in the near future confidently blaze the trail for further struggle.

---

[1] See *WMR*, January, February and March 1977.

Investigating the Economy

JERONIMO CARRERA

CC member, Communist Party of Venezuela

SCIENTIFIC research into the national realities amid which our Party is operating is an urgent and highly important task facing us Venezuelan Communists.

Marxism-Leninism is something more than the theory of proletarian revolution. To be sure, it is primarily the doctrine guiding the working class, but in today's world it is accepted by consistently anti-imperialist national liberation movements. Experience has confirmed this fact on more than one occasion. However, the theoretical principles, evolved by the founders of Marxism-Leninism and being carried forward by the collective effort of Communist and Workers' Parties, can actually link up with revolutionary practice only if the revolutionary vanguard party is capable of accurately assessing the situation in its country. And this can only be done by carefully and systematically studying all data characterising society.

Our experience suggests that inadequate analysis of the facts or wrong conclusions from such analysis are likely to lead one astray just as badly as abstract theorising. Overestimation of the gains of the revolution or of the degree of maturity of the conditions needed for this or that action results in mistakes and reverses. So does underestimation of the opportunities and potentialities of the revolutionary forces.

We Venezuelan Communists have to rectify mistakes in Party work caused by specific circumstances. The fact is that ever since it was founded, that is over 46 years ago, the Communist Party has generally had to operate in the face of brutal repression by successive governments subservient to imperialism. It should be clear that a party fighting for survival, a party most of whose leaders have passed through the ordeal of imprisonment and whose every activist must devote his energies above all to struggle against dictatorial regimes, could not concern itself adequately with organised research. We still meet with serious difficulties in this matter, as well as in the Marxist-Leninist schooling of our cadres.

The Party came up against these difficulties first of all in drafting its Programme, approved in final form by the Fifth Congress (November 1974). Naturally, we did our best to generalise in the Programme the knowledge

acquired by scientifically analysing the situation at home and in the world. The Party carried on this work for years, with varying success. That we were not always successful was a result of our inadequate ability to estimate national realities correctly. The Third Party Congress made a fruitless attempt at such an estimation. It is highly probable that the negative consequences of that attempt translated themselves into the serious mistakes made by us in the period immediately following, and described by us as "years of armed struggle". Afterwards, from 1967 on, when our Central Committee proceeded to the greatly needed rectification of our policy, the urgency of serious research enabling us to interpret correctly the deep changes which we were witnessing in the domestic economy and in society and which we had been unable to assess, let alone forecast, became perfectly obvious.

The gradual transition from underground work to work in conditions of legality (1968-70) was effected easily enough due to a combination of several factors, first of all the split in the government party and its electoral defeat in December 1968. However, it was attended by serious inner-Party problems that developed into dangerous crises. This prevented deeper analysis of the causes of the left deviations that had lost us those of our supporters among the masses whom we had won over as a result of the defeat of the Perez Jimenez dictatorship in January 1958. It also hampered the conduct of research demanded of us by the changing realities of a country that was developing fast along capitalist lines but was seen by us as it had been twenty years earlier.

A daily output of three million barrels of oil over more than two decades led in the end to the complete disintegration of the antiquated semi-feudal structures typical of Venezuela. It was at this stage, when the country was under the pro-US dictatorship of Juan Vicente Gomez, that the CPV was founded in 1931. Imperialist penetration made for the rapid and intensive development of a capitalist economy that was, however, lopsided and dependent. In turn, these changes told strongly on the class composition of our society. The working class gained in numbers and strength, but then so did the section of the bourgeoisie that was linked with imperialism and was carrying on financial and industrial activities encouraged by the patronage of foreign monopolies.

These new Venezuelan realities were examined by the Fourth CPV Congress (January 1971). It adopted "General Principles for a Programme of the CPV" analysing the changes that had occurred. The document made the following important statement: "In these ten years, the consolidation of certain sections of the bourgeoisie linked with imperialism and of state capitalism, as well as increased budget appropriations, have produced results favourable to the ruling classes." The congress also passed a "Resolution on Programme Principles" empowering the CC to appoint a committee that would draft the Programme for discussion by the next congress, and emphasising that it must be a "document in a Leninist spirit, succinct, simple, expressive, clear, and enriched by the analysis to be made by the CC". The resolution said that this called for "collective research in an atmosphere of validity and creative application of Marxism-Leninism to Venezuelan reality, in the spirit of loyalty to the working-class cause. These requirements were largely disregarded owing to factional activity in the Party."

Having accomplished this difficult task at their Fifth Congress, the Communists now have, for the first time ever, a Programme combining, as we see it, the general principles of Marxism-Leninism and conclusions from the experience of brother parties, our own experience and specific analysis of the social and economic conditions of our country.

In drafting the Programme and continuing our research, we have always concentrated on economic problems. Why? First of all, because political processes cannot be understood without analysing economic relations; this classical Marxist-Leninist tenet has been confirmed by our own experience, too. Secondly, we realise that man's liberation is unthinkable without freeing labour. Lastly, and from the purely practical point of view, we cannot defend the working people's present-day interests, let alone create a long-range alternative to the economic policy of the bourgeoisie, without an in-depth study of the economy. In the absence of such a specific economic alternative, political struggle, for its part, ceases to be concrete and meaningful. It is important that the working people fully appreciate that they are fighting for a better life, for a position in the production sphere and in society more fit for man, and that the outlook for fundamental improvements through struggle is definite and real.

Experience tells us that economic problems should always be investigated according to the Marxist postulate that one must take account of realities and eschew subjective prejudices and views. After all, we Communists do not study economic reality to become university professors excelling in erudition. To us, economic research is a revolutionary task we carry out to help the working class in freeing itself from exploitation and building a new society. This means that we must begin by studying the working people's condition and the wages they are paid, so that the Party may advance concrete, scientifically sound slogans understandable to the masses, and direct the class struggles towards its ultimate goal by joining in the activity of trade unions and other mass organisations of the working people.

The Communists of Venezuela have learnt the lessons of past mistakes and are rectifying them. This is seen, among other things, in an appeal published by the United Workers' Centre of Venezuela (CUTV),[1] which proposes to other union centres united action against the rising cost of living. One has only to look into the domestic economic situation to realise that at present the struggle against the mounting cost of living is the key to mobilising the masses, which, in turn, is necessary for the defence of democratic gains, to say nothing of furthering nationalisation in the interest of national sovereignty and in keeping with the people's vital interests.

The chief subject of the Party's economic research has been changing in step with the evolution of the national economy, which had an agrarian basis at first, then came to be based on mining and has since been assuming a more marked industrial character. Over a long period, the agrarian question was the basic subject of research and we may say that we have made noticeable headway in this sphere, as two books on rural Venezuela written jointly by two of our comrades, Alonso Ojeda Olaechea and Jorge Santana, indicate.[2] They were published by the agrarian department of our CC. Afterwards we moved on from agrarian questions to oil problems, a thorough study of which is indispensable now to any Venezuelan political party.

The Communist position on oil policy has consistently favoured nationalisation of this vital industry, an idea put forward by the Communists as far back as 1931. We have for years stressed the need to wrest the nation's principal asset from the grip of imperialist monopolies, shown up their price-juggling and proposed steps to make better use of oil royalties.

The range of economic problems claiming our constant attention has widened considerably. Once purely national, these problems link up more and more with the world economy and growing international trade. Such is, in particular, the oil problem, which positively cannot be treated as a domestic matter any longer. The world energy crisis, which took dramatic forms in 1973, made it clear that the oil problem can no longer be solved separately by each country or even through bilateral agreements. The Venezuelan government saw the new reality early enough and has for a long time sought international co-operation formulas for the most profitable utilisation of oil. Venezuela is a founding member of OPEC. The CPV has firmly supported OPEC membership, but, on the other hand, has invariably urged the government to take a more militant stand on imperialist monopoly in this international organisation.

Of course, we Communists must study fluctuations on the world oil market very carefully, for they tell inevitably on the home policy of our country. We follow with unremitting attention the policies laid down by OPEC resolutions. At the same time, we call on the ruling quarters of our country to end the restraint which Venezuela has traditionally shown in the organisation and to side firmly with Algeria, Libya, Iraq and other countries which demonstrate their ability and readiness to pursue within the organisation a policy differing from that imposed by the multinationals.

Our Party also looks carefully into the integration processes under way in Latin America. Integration policy problems are admittedly very delicate and complicated. In spite of their overall dependence on US imperialism, Latin America's national economies are at very different stages of development and differ greatly in many respects. Besides, US interference and the ambitions of the domestic bourgeoisie, which is not really agreeable to integration (these two factors have made integration impossible so far), are serious obstacles to progress in this direction in the foreseeable future. There is no doubt, however, that all Latin American countries are increasingly aware of the objective need to join in integration processes. This need resulted in the successive formation of the Latin American Free Trade Association (LAFTA), Central American Common Market (true, both organisations proved unviable) and, later on, the Andean Pact, as well as the Latin American Economic System, which is a novel development and attracts attention.

The Fifth CPV Congress took an explicit stand on this issue. "Economic integration—LAFTA and the subregional Andean Pact," says the Party Programme, "are intended to curb the economic policy of imperialism in a certain way and to a certain extent with a view to making better use of natural resources and diversifying trade and foreign markets. The Andean Pact, which is backed by progressive governments resisting imperialism, has assumed a progressive trend. Venezuela's entry into the pact was a correct step and can be used as a means of resistance to imperialist domination."

The CPV Programme makes principled estimations and stresses that owing

to a predominantly dependent economy, economic integration processes i Latin America will always be contradictory. "It will depend on the people fight," it states, "whether integration has a positive meaning and serve economic liberation, or whether it becomes an ineffective instrument controlle behind the scenes by multinational monopolies." In effect, this idea i expressed in the Declaration of the Conference of Communist Parties of Lati America and the Caribbean (Havana, June 1975). We Venezuelan Communist note with satisfaction that as far as analysis of the potentialities of the Andea Pact is concerned, our position fully coincided with the position stated in th brother parties' collective document. However, we must say for the sake o accuracy that our Party had some difficulty in taking so realistic an approacl to the issue. This is seen, for instance, in the confused joint statement made ii mid-1968 by the economic research committee and Political Bureau of ou Party, both strongly influenced at the time by experts who were actuall prompted by disastrous petty-bourgeois nationalism and had to withdrav from our Party somewhat later.

The experience of drafting the CPV Programme shows how very difficult i was for the Party to make a creative, Marxist-Leninist study of Venezuelai reality. However, we must apparently add that our lag in this matter, as wel as in the study of social sciences generally, was also due to the fact tha Venezuela's universities began to teach these subjects much later than othe universities of the continent. Central University began economic researcl slightly more than 30 years ago. Until then, the country had virtually lackec even elementary statistics on its economy. The first attempts to study the national economy, made by Venezuelan Marxists individually and in the absence of a serious statistical basis, inevitably led to inaccurate and at time: even unscientific conclusions. Moreover, the universities were for a long time dominated by the adverse influence of bourgeois economic thought, such a: Keynesian theories brought in by people educated in London. Fortunately political changes in 1958 and the introduction of university autonomy made it at long last possible to teach Marxism in the faculty of economic sciences.

Ever since then, the universities have been specialising in economic research, expanding it by adding new themes. Researchers understandably show particular interest in problems of the developing countries and in everything relating to oil. Similar progress has been taking place in other fields of research, such as agrarian economics, planning, foreign trade, demography. At the same time, other faculties have greatly expanded historical, political and sociological research. All this has produced a large amount of scientific information, made available to us in the form of numerous private or government publications. Valuable works have been written by university lecturers, including D. F. Maza Zavala, Ramon Lozada Aldana, Armando Cordova, Jose Eliseo Lopez, German Carrera Damas, Pedro Esteban Mejia, Rodolfo Quintero, Hector Mujica, Hector Malave Mata and Miguel Acosta Saignes. They belong to a group of researchers who have used Marixt methodology to analyse life in Venezuela, past and present.

Of course, we Communists do our best to use this increased flow of scientific evidence. At the same time, however, an intensive anti-Soviet and anti-Communist campaign is being conducted in the universities, causing ideological confusion among teachers and students holding left-wing views.

This can be seen in works of recent years written in universities and imbued with *tercerism* "third-worldism") and distrust of existing socialism. We Communists take this into account in our activity.

As detente spreads, the world-wide ideological struggle becomes sharper. In particular, reformist ideologists, who are always in a privileged position because they can use the powerful mass media, are carrying on divisive activities, advocating a sort of nihilism in regard to the nation in countries where a strenuous struggle is being waged against powerful foreign monopolies, as in Venezuela. For us Communists the best answer to this is to publicise our contribution to the study of Venezuelan reality, specifying the country's problems and saying why our Party proposes this or that solution.

This contribution is still very modest (we do not say so to pay lip-service to self-criticism). However, there is evidence of the early fruits of our effort to study fundamental economic problems of great importance to the Venezuelan nation today and in the future. A few months ago, two interesting works by noted CPV leaders came out in Caracas: Hemmy Croes *Whither the Andean Pact?* and Radames Larrazabal and Eduardo Lopez Perez, *Oil—the Public Sector of the Economy—and Socialism.*

We will certainly carry our research deeper to ascertain current economic trends and foresee their most likely political effects. In the new situation created by steps to nationalise oil and iron ore,[3] which the Venezuelan government has negotiated with foreign companies and which should have a strong impact on the country's policy, the Fifth CC CPV Plenum (February 2, 1976) adopted a detailed statement analysing the people's economic difficulties. The problems which the resolution deals with are related to the modified terms of operation in the oil industry, the government's tax policy and investment plans made in the interests of the domestic bourgeoisie, and an unwarranted foreign debt which increases our dependence on the financial centres of international monopoly capital.

The CC CPV, confirming this orientation, made a new detailed analysis of the national economy. At its Seventh Plenum (November 13, 1976), it circulated a new statement in this connection revealing the plight of the masses and criticising, with good reason, the economic policy of the government. At the same time, the CC reaffirmed its attitude to technological and trade problems seriously affecting the interests of Petroleos de Venezuela, the national oil company. The only solution to these problems is large-scale co-operation with such countries as the Soviet Union, one of the world's biggest oil producers. "Venezuela," the statement says, "has the resources needed for a constructive solution of these problems. There are countries willing to co-operate in solving them. Everything depends on whether Petroleos de Venezuela will take this road, which we will have to take sooner or later. There can be no doubt that in the long run Venezuela will put an end for all time to dependence on imperialist powers and find ways of mutually beneficial international co-operation."

The concept of independent development of the nation's leading industry set out by the CPV is based on the socialist countries' solidarity with the peoples fighting for the right to dispose of their natural resources. We consider it very important that during the Soviet visit of President Carlos Andres Perez of Venezuela (November 1976), these views of the country's economic progress

found expression in the signing of a basic agreement on economic an industrial co-operation in addition to the announcement of forthcomir "negotiations to study the possibilities of concluding a trade agreement ar examine other problems of trade and economic co-operation."

The very fact that these questions were raised suggests that we Communis will have to devote increasing effort to a systematic study of all the intricaci of today's dynamic economy, especially those of its aspects which have so f: received comparatively little attention from us. This is why the CC plans f(inner-Party education now being put into effect throughout the country close co-operation with regional committees devote much attention to mo thorough training of Party cadres on the basis of Marxism-Leninism and cultivating an interest in research and in closer study of the people's life.

---

[1] Influenced by the Communists.—*Ed.*

[2] *Situacion Actual del Campo Venezolano* (Caracas, 1970) and *Tesis Agraria* (Carac: 1961).

[3] It was discussed at length in "Venezuela: Problems Unsolved by Nationalisation *WMR*, July 1976.

Why We Are With the Communists

WMR continues this series[1] with interviews its correspondents h: with Party members in Luxembourg and supporters of the CPL.

PIERRE SCHOEMBERG
Worker

I MADE my political choice a long time ago and was one of the first to jo the Communist Party of Luxembourg. I have never had cause to regret n choice because only the Communist Party is capable of understanding ai sympathising with working class interests, and only as a member of the Par is it possible to wage a consistent struggle for these interests.

My case is most likely very similar to that of many other workers. In 19: my father advised me to go into the engineering industry, and as a youth experienced capitalist exploitation. Wages were low and labour conditio terrible, the speed-up system was pushed to the limit and the bosses, fro manager down to shop superintendent, had unlimited powers to hire and fir

I soon felt a strong resentment rising in me against this system and I do n know how this would have ended if I had not met some people at the pla: where I worked (ARBED—Belval) with experience and foresight, and wh knew how to wage an effective struggle. It was from them that I learned abo Soviet Russia, and that there existed an organisation in Luxembourg that w: fighting against exploitation and social injustice. I joined the Party after mee ing and talking with the then Party Chairman Zenon Bernard.

The thirties were difficult years for us. The Party was still weak but, neve theless, was able to achieve a measure of success. In 1934, Zenon Berna

became the first Luxembourg Communist to be elected to Parliament, and in 1937, when the government planned to ban the Communist Party, a nationwide poll showed that the majority were against such a law. During the Second World War our Party revealed its genuine patriotism and from then on the Communist Party became firmly established in the country's political life.

Our Party's consistent policy in the course of all these years, its fidelity to Marxism-Leninism and its active proletarian internationalism, its courageous actions in defence of the working people's demands have won it respect and influence. I am proud to be one of the oldest members of the Communist Party and I shall continue helping to achieve working class victory in Luxembourg.

ANNY MÜLLER-SCHOUP

Nurse

I THINK I joined the Party because I was against the fascists and against war and it was the Communists who were always so outspokenly for peace.

I come from a working-class family. My father is a house painter and during the last war he was in the Resistance Movement. Although my parents were not Party members they always supported solidarity movements with other peoples, often took me to meetings they attended and I think that is where my anti-war feelings started growing. They became even stronger when several years later I saw the remains of the Ravensbrück concentration camp in what is now the GDR. The head of our group, a member of the CP Luxembourg, described her experiences in that camp where she was interned during the war and told us about fascism. I was deeply moved by what I heard, by what I saw at that concentration camp, and by the people, particularly by the many anti-fascists, I met in the GDR.

Soon after, I joined the Luxembourg Progressive Youth organisation that was opposing war and fascism and advocated friendship among the peoples. Its programme expressed my feelings and I was an active member. There were many Communists in this youth movement, among them the man who later became my husband. Their talks and discussions helped us to see and understand a great deal.

It was some time, however, before I joined the Party, for I still had many prejudices, especially religious ones. The patience and tact of the Party members with whom we worked in the youth organisation helped me to gradually overcome my prejudices and then I joined the Communist Party. This step changed my whole life. My Party work helped to form my consciousness. Party studies and the fact that I could see for myself the successes of existing socialism strengthened my convictions still more. The daily struggle for man's most noble aspirations—peace and social equality—is a source of strength and confidence. I feel that my activities are helping people and that I am making a modest contribution to the common cause. For me it is very satisfying that I can live in just this way.

FERNAND PASQUALONI

Welder

I WAS an apprentice in a steel plant when I got my first taste of politics. Our training was designed to provide the plant with skilled but obedient workers

social barriers raised against youth, and the first bombs dropped on Vietnan impelled us to discuss politics.

At that time left-extremist groups used to hand out leaflets at the fact gates and they were the cause of heated debates. We, a group of apprenti got in touch with a Trotskyist organisation and for a time were under influence. The members of this organisation were mainly petty-bourge better educated than we, and at first we were not able to argue with them *an equal footing, nor to counter their reasoning. And they naturally tc advantage of this. But, we studied Marxist literature and little by little start analysing what the Trotskyists said and did.*

Our working conditions, the work of the trade unions, our meetings a talks with Communist Party members helped us to see that the goals of t Trotskyists did not go beyond a petty-bourgeois utopia. The members of th organisation, petty-bourgeois to the core, were not able to comprehend t workers' problems and did not express their interests. And almost all t workers in that organisation decided to leave it. After breaking with t Trotskyists, we realised that the only correct thing to do was to fight for t working class cause as members of its vanguard—the Communist Party. V agreed that this was a realistic party, defending the people's needs, a pa that aspired towards scientifically grounded goals.

It is indicative that at the present time the so-called ultra-leftists are losi influence in Luxembourg, they are no longer as active as before. And t workers and progressive intellectuals are beginning to see the true charac of these groups, while the Communist Party is increasing its influence and steadily defending the interests of the country's working class and the you on the basis of Marxism-Leninism and a profound analysis of reality, and n on a utopian basis. Together with the countries of existing socialism, and wi the balance of forces moving in favour of socialism, our Party is working wi energy for detente, peace, democracy and for socialism.

SYLVIE WAGNER

Housewife

NEITHER I nor my husband, who works for an automobile sales compa has ever been a member of any of Luxembourg's political parties. But at t last municipal elections we voted Communist. There were several reasons w I preferred the Communist candidate to the Socialist, Social-Democrat Democratic, or Christian-Social.

Just as most people, we think of our future and the future of our childr and we see that there are many problems still to be settled. For example, t secondary school system, its programme and methods should be improve The problem of old people is acute and the attitude towards the aged is ve unjust. I believe that the Communists sincerely wish to improve the existi situation and that is why I voted for their candidates.

I also think there should be a certain unity among all who wish to impro the conditions of the working people, and, most important, they should sha common goals and ways of achieving these goals. Strengthening the positio of the Communist Party could help to build such united action, and, co sequently, more could be done for all the people and not just for the rich wl

are not concerned with the needs and cares of the common people. That, also, is one of the reasons I voted for the Communist Party even though I do not agree with all its statements.

ALI RUCKERT
Journalist

APPARENTLY I have good heredity, for my grandfather, who was a miner, was a Communist Party activist back in the early thirties. I grew up with the stories he used to tell me of the workers' movement in our country, how he took part in demonstrations that were broken up by mounted police, and about the Communist Resistance during the years of Hitler's fascism.

He was always enthusiastic when he spoke of the Soviet Union where the workers took power into their own hands. Several years later, as a member of the Progressive Youth of Luxembourg, I visited the Artek Children's Summer Camp on the Black Sea Coast in the USSR where I saw for myself everything that my grandfather, an old Communist, had told about the country in which he had such faith, about existing socialism.

Together with my father, a steel worker, also a Party member, we took part in many Party activities and May Day demonstrations. We lived in the workers' neighbourhood of Differdengen and from my childhood I experienced the inequality that workers' children come up against everywhere. And in school I felt this even more acutely, because the teachers were anti-communist minded and the children were mostly from the upper classes.

Naturally, I was affected by all this, and when I joined the Party—on its 50th anniversary—although I was only 16, I was fully aware that I was joining a party in which I believed implicitly.

[1] See *WMR*, January and March 1977.

Viewpoints

Global Forecasts and Realistic Solutions

Some Bourgeois Concepts of Economic-Mathematical Ecological Models

NIKOLAI FEDORENKO
Academician (USSR)

THE long history of man's interaction with nature is replete with sharp contradictions and conflicts. In this age of the ongoing scientific and technological revolution such problems as rational use of natural resources, preservation of the biosphere and its principal components, world and regional ecological equilibrium harmonised with society's production activities, have gone far beyond national bounds.[1] To one or another degree, they concern every country, and all countries have an equal interest in their solution.[2]

But they are posed differently in different regions and countries. In the

developed capitalist countries, for instance, the most acute are the problems (
environmental pollution, fresh-water and land-usage balance, and consumptic
of finite natural resources, notably imported fuels. The crucial problem
many developing countries is the supply of food and fresh water, preservatic
of the soil and of ecological systems. For instance, the severe drought (
1968-74 in Chad, Mauritania, Mali, Niger, Senegal and Upper Volta, wi
their combined population of more than 20 million, drastically reduced gra
harvests and cattle herds, with resultant hunger for millions. In fact, tl
droughts threatened the very existence of ecological systems vital to agı
culture. Meteorologists and climatologists are inclined to the view that tl
drought, the longest for many years, was largely caused by factors related ı
the global pollution of the atmosphere.

The socialist countries, too, have ecological problems, but they stand r
comparison, in scale and gravity, with ecological crisis developments in tl
capitalist countries. For in socialist societies, with public ownership of tl
means of production, there is an incomparably more rational pattern of co
sumption of key natural resources. Thus, ecological crisis phenomena ,
various levels are not a fatal inevitability under socialism.

It will thus be seen that, though ecological problems are world-wide, the
scope and gravity are to a decisive degree determined by the nature of tl
social system. And it is no mere accident that the developed capitali
countries, with their powerful economic and technological potential which, oı
would think, should enable them to prevent or at least moderate ecologic
conflicts, exert the greatest destructive influence on the environment. In fac
the general deterioration of the world ecological situation is primarily due ı
the aggravation of the many social and economic contradictions of capitalisr
It can be said that the ecological crisis has, in a certain sense, become the foci
of all the structural defects and social antagonisms of modern bourgeo
society.

The scope and gravity of the ecological crisis have promoted bourgeo
scientists to search for a way out, relying heavily on the use of economic(
mathematical methods and computers. The use of sophisticated techniques,
was believed, would provide a comprehensive prognosis of mankind's futur

In the veritable deluge of literature on the subject, these experiments ı
global modelling are of particular interest. For they cover the main factors (
world development; analyse their totality and demographic, economic, ge(
graphical, geological, etc., interaction; produce a dynamic, rather than stati
picture of ecological processes, and employ quantifying methods based on tl
latest computer techniques.

But it should be borne in mind that these global models can have
mystifying effect if the modellers use their sophisticated methodology to sul
stantiate speculative conclusions. Hence, all global models should be subjectc
to exacting and detailed Marxist analysis, both from the standpoint (
methodology and the authenticity of primary data.

An analysis of global models devised in the past ten years will reveal thi
bourgeois investigators, deliberately or unwittingly, strove to use ecology f(
class purposes, namely, to obscure the contradictions between labour an
capital and the link between the ecological crisis, the general crisis (
capitalism and imperialism's neocolonialist policy.

One such global model, which in many ways predetermined subsequent work by bourgeois researchers, was World-3, worked out on assignment from the Club of Rome, an ostensibly independent non-government organisation. But it is no secret that the Club is made up mostly of representatives of big business and work on its early models was financed by the giant West German Volkswagen concern.

The World-3 model and its later modification by D. Meadows[3] treats the global economic system as a whole, without geographical differentiation, and uses five basic factors: population, food, finite resources, industrial capital and pollution.

Meadows and his co-authors worked on the premise that the existing system of values leads to exponential, undifferentiated massive growth of the five factors. And from this the conclusion is drawn that mankind must achieve a state of "global equilibrium" in order to ward off "collapse of the world". Meadows and his colleagues set out to prove that "global equilibrium" could be achieved under capitalism. In doing so they revealed their understanding of the "strategy of saving the system" through a combination of technical and social methods. In particular, one of the more recent, 1975, models suggests stabilising existing industrial plant and population, recycling finite resources, reducing by three-fourths their share in per-unit of output, with a similar reduction in per-unit pollution, and priority development of food production.

Publication of the first results of Meadows' and his co-authors' project, in "Limits to Growth",[4] precipitated a sharp controversy in scientific circles throughout the world.

Marxist critics saw in this and in subsequent research by the Meadows' group an attempt to exploit the prestige of economico-mathematical methods to buttress reactionary Malthusian ideas and the neocolonialist policy of blackmail. Significantly, bourgeois scientists, too, found themselves obliged to point out the large number of fundamental flaws in the Meadows' report. Thus, researchers at Sussex University in Britain, who produced the most comprehensive critical assessment of "Limits to Growth",[5] found that its initial premise, exponential growth in its main variables, was no more than a modern version of the Malthus theory.

There were serious objections also to the concept of "global equilibrium". Many bourgeois researchers accused its authors of advocating what amounted to stagnation, a "ban" on economic growth in developing countries.

Important, too, is the fact that even the early critics of the Meadows' model pointed to its fallacious approach to the world as a socially and politically undifferentiated homogeneous entity. And it was not by chance that later propects, of 1972-74 vintage, tried to overcome the basic shortcomings of the World-3 model. Among these the most interesting, in my view, are the following: "Mankind at the Turning Point" (Mesarovic and Pestel),[6] the Latin-American global model (A. Herrera),[7] the Japanese "Global Constraints and New Vision for Development" (Kaya and Suzuki),[8] the Dutch "Problems of Population Doubling" (Linnemann),[9] the Swiss DEMATEL (H. Thiemann and A. Gabus).[10]

Mesarovic and Pestel, the authors of the second Club of Rome report, "Mankind at the Turning Point", mindful of the criticism of World-3, discarded Meadows' "exponential undifferentiated" growth in favour of

"organic" (differentiated and balanced) growth, treating the world as a syst of ten interacting regoins: North America; Western Europe; Japan; Austral South Africa and other developed market-economy countries; Eastern Euro including the USSR; Latin America; North Africa and the Middle Ea Tropical Africa; South and Southeast Asia, and China. And unlike Meado whose model covered a 130-year period, they chose a shorter, 50-ye projection (1975-2025), on the assumption that regional catastrophies wou occur within this period, though not simultaneously in different regions a for different reasons.

Having chosen what they considered to be the more acute aspects of wo development—the national-income gap between developed and developi countries, the problems of energy, food, democragphy and the oil crisis they constructed five partial models and, having analysed typical crisis situ tions in different regions, arrived at the conclusion that a "population grow —food shortage" crisis would first hit Africa and South Asia; a "populati growth—growing unemployment" crisis—Latin America; a "producti growth—raw materials shortage and environmental pollution" crisis—t developed capitalist countries. And though they tried to approach the proble of global ecology objectively, their recommendations are still of a pure defensive nature. For instance, in analysing the food problem in developi countries all they recommended is assistance by developed capitalist countri Their conclusion on another problem, "oil suppliers—oil producers", in effe supports the thesis that, instead of a confrontation with the multinationals a the developed capitalist countries, the oil producers would find it mo profitable to invest in the oil-consuming, that is, the developed capital countries.

At first sight, the Argentine researchers (the Herrera model) seem to ta the very opposite view. Their top priority is meeting the needs of the develo ing countries as a means of powering a general economic upsurge and wardi off the ruinous consequences of ecological crisis. But they divide all t countries into "poor" and "rich", thus lumping together developed capitali and socialist countries. They counsel suspending industrial growth in develo ing countries and redistributing capital in favour of the "poor" countries. Th wholly disregards the all-important need to "redistribute wealth" within t developing countries, in other words, eliminate the privileges of the industri and landed interests and the wide incomes gap through progressive social a economic reforms.

The Japanese project, "Global Constraints and a New Vision for Develo ment", outlines an optimal production structure within the "develope developing countries" framework. The first part of the project analyses t world raw-materials market and constructs a model for prognosticati changes in the world climate. The Japanese calculations show that the unde lying problem up to the end of this century will, in all probability, be t disparity between the demand and supply of energy rather than a shortage natural resources. If energy consumption grows no more than 10-fold, t authors do not anticipate any serious impact on the world climate.

Like the authors of "Mankind at the Turning Point", the Japane researchers, in the second part of their project, divide the world into regio (North America, Oceania, Western Europe, USSR and the East-Europe

socialist countries, Central and South America, Japan, China and the other Asian countries, and Africa). Each region is divided into six production sectors: agriculture, the extractive, light, heavy and assembly industries, and services. The purpose of these regional models is to optimise production structures to raise living standards within a balanced pattern of foreign trade. The Japanese authors urge more attention to agriculture in Latin America and Africa as well as in North America and Oceania.

This stress on the need to boost agricultural production against the background of ecological crisis is the result of the aggravated problem of hunger and malnutrition in the developing countries, which the authors of this and other models associate chiefly with population growth.

Indicative in this respect is "The Problem of Population Doubling", a special study of the Club of Rome directed by the Dutch scientist Linnemann. His project, based on the "agriculture-food production model", divides the world into three groups of countries: those with "free market economies" (capitalist), "centrally-planned economies" (socialist) and "developing". Then there are ten regions which more or less coincide with those of the Mesarovic-Pestel model, and 108 geographico-climatic zones.

What distinguishes Linnemann's from earlier models is its differentiation of social strata within the developed capitalist and developing countries. In each of these it singles out six social groups,[11] based on income and food-consumption levels, and offers solutions of their food problems. This geographical and social differentiation also makes for more realistic conclusions and balanced computations. In particular, Linnemann shows that the world food shortage is not absolute but relative; the present level of production does not assure an adequate food supply because of disparate consumption levels due not to technological, but rather social and economic factors, which are responsible for the tortuously slow introduction of efficient cultivation methods to increase production.

It will thus be seen that in recent years global modelling has evolved towards a closer understanding of the geographical and social differentiation of the world, and a more business-like, "non-sensational" examination of ecological problems.

In fact, even many bourgeois scientists associated with the Club of Rome have come to see that, in the final analysis, realisation of partial demographical, ecological and other conclusions based on the results of global modelling, depend on society's social and economic strategy. Consciously or unwittingly, some of these scientists have actually discarded the widespread bourgeois propaganda thesis about the universal character of the ecological crisis which, allegedly, is due entirely to increased consumption, with scant regard to the class differentiation of society.

This has been accompanied by the growing realisation that the present pattern of international economic relations has to be revised. On assignment from the Club of Rome, a group of researchers headed by Nobel Prize winner Jan Tinbergen submitted a report significantly titled "Reshaping the International Order".[12] It is directly linked with a number of UN documents adopted with the participation of developing countries, notably the Declaration of Cocoyoc.[13]

The Tinbergen report recommends introduction of an international pay-

ments unit to replace gold and the US dollar; establishment of a new integrated international trade system by improving the present division of labour; development of agriculture, etc. It also calls for disarmament and use of resulting economised funds for peaceful purposes. Last, but not least, it discusses, albeit inconsistently, the social aspects of the ecological crisis, and this leads its authors to counsel changing the system of values in the "consumer society".[14]

However, despite their awareness of the connection between the ecological crisis and the economic and social foundations of capitalist society, bourgeois researchers virtually make no recommendation that might encroach on these foundations, nor on the interests of those who own the economy, notably the multinationals.[15]

But it has to be admitted that global modelling has made possible a new approach to a number of vital problems. For one thing, it has revealed the scientific and practical fallacy of partial prognostications—population growth, energy production, increase of cultivated areas, or exploitation of sea resources—though such prognostications seemed to be firmly backed by demographic, energy, agronomic and oceanographic data. True, our knowledge of the quantitative regularities governing the "nature-society" ratio are patently insufficient, so that all global models are still a very long way from perfection. Nevertheless, the conclusions drawn from them, and considering the present higher degree of scientific substantiation, have served as the basis for a number of practical measures of state-monopoly regulation of the use of natural resources. In the United States, for example, appropriations for environmental protection have increased from a very modest figure to billions of dollars. Japan and many West-European capitalist countries are following a similar policy.

But no amount of global modelling can erase the deep contradictions in the capitalist countries' policy on the use of natural resources. One example is the multinationals' attempts to transfer "dirty" industries (metallurgy, chemicals) from developed capitalist to developing countries, in other words, "export" their polluted atmosphere under the slogan of "assisting industrialisation". The United States and a number of other capitalist countries, anxious to lower pollution levels at home, have introduced tough environment-quality standards. But with the economic crisis they are often lowered or simply disregarded. One could cite numerous other examples of the restricted character of ecological solutions in conditions of capitalism and imperialist domination.

In the non-socialist part of the world there is an acute awareness of the need for a democratic and socialist alternative to state-monopoly regulation of the use of nature and its resources. The Communists are campaigning for that, because bourgeois governments are not in a position to curb the monopolies, which are mainly responsible for environmental deterioration.

The advantages of the system based on public ownership of the means of production and economic planning stand out with especial clarity against this background. For whereas many aspects of the ecological crisis in the capitalist world continue to deteriorate, the Soviet Union and other members of the socialist community are taking substantial steps to preserve and improve the environment. They are working out and implementing a system of measures to assure the socialist use of nature and its resources, a system consonant with

the scale of social production and the requirements of the scientific and technological revolution. This should not be taken to mean that the socialist countries have no problems in the interaction of society and nature. The main reason for the emergence of such problems under socialism, in the view of this author, is that the environmental protection aspects of production are not always adequately taken into account in our overall system of economic planning and management. To set things right, Soviet scientists are working out guidelines for the rational use of nature and recommendations for environmental protection programmes.

The socialist countries are devoting relatively less attention to global models, first, because they are concentrating on comprehensive economic-planning models, and second, because ecological problems are less sharply posed than in capitalist countries. Nonetheless, accumulated experience in devising a large number of big and super-big models has enabled Soviet scientists to run a number of experiments in global modelling. This work was conducted by the USSR Academy of Sciences Central Economico-Mathematical Institute and Computer Centre, and the Head Administration of the Hydrological and Meteorological Service under the USSR Council of Ministers.[16] And experience has shown that in devising global models of any type we have to contend with a number of objective difficulties: inadequacy and unreliability of our statistical base; the complexity of defining the correlation between factors and the transition from partial quantitative to general indicators; the contradictory criteria of investment priorities in a resources-deficit situation, etc. That being so, the degree of authenticity tends to limit the application of global models to general prognostications of the main tendencies in the conduct of modelised systems. At the present stage, this makes it difficult to combine these with operating economic prognostication and planning models.

In the opinion of a number of Soviet researchers, the use of nature in a socialist society should be regarded as a special type of social and economic activity aimed at fuller satisfaction of the rising requirements of all members of society by better utilisation of natural resources, preserving and multiplying (or improving the quality, or supplying adequate substitutes) of natural resources in the interests of succeeding generations; preserving the equilibrium between industrial expansion and biological stability of the environment to assure the continued development of civilisation and, in fact, life on earth.[17]

In recent years work has begun in the USSR on a uniform nation-wide system of planning and managing the use of natural resources, a system that accords with social and economic conditions in developed socialist society and with the scientific theory of the unity and interdependence of all types of natural resources. This integrated programme includes the following: elaboration of a nation-wide system of accounting, planning and economic stimulation of the rational use of nature; establishment of an interdepartmental board to supervise the use of natural resources and protect the environment and, lastly, the development and perfection of uniform standards in the use of nature and its resources.

Along with this, economic-growth models are being worked out, providing for tight ecological restrictions, with natural resources (e.g., pure water and pure air) as the determinative factors in allocating material and labour resources for technological processes.[18]

The methodological principles governing rational use of nature are complemented by the implementation of legislatively endorsed major regional programmes. These include measures to protect Lake Baikal, the Volga and Azov-Black Sea Basin, also comprehensive industry-wide projects, such as new, non-waste lines of production, etc.

All these scientifically substantiated and practically applied measures—legislative and planning, regional and industry-wide—show that real, and not merely hypothetical, solutions of ecological problems are fully possible.

The socialist countries are thus successfully solving the problems involved in the proper use of nature. But they believe that systematic extensive and close international co-operation is a *sine qua non* of any real solution of global ecological problems. They regard these questions in the general context of the Leninist foreign policy of peaceful coexistence of states with different social systems, in the context of continued efforts to extend detente.

For instance, the Soviet Union is now carrying out a number of research and practical projects within international organisations and on the basis of bilateral agreements. This work is being conducted most consistently within the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance, where all research is subject to a uniform long-range plan. In fact, measures to protect the environment are considered a major aspect of the CMEA countries scientific and technological co-operation.

At the same time, the Soviet Union and other fraternal socialist countries have an active share in the work of such authoritative international organisations as the UN Economic Commission for Europe (ECE), the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP), and others. Besides a number of environmental-protection projects are being carried out under bilateral agreements with the United States, France, Japan, Iran, Afghanistan and several other countries. The Soviet Union is thus making a weighty contribution to preventing the present ecological crisis afflicting the capitalist world from reaching global dimensions.

An effective system of equal and constructive international co-operation in protecting the environment is today the only realistic possibility of solving world-wide ecological problems. And such co-operation would make for a healthier political climate on our planet.

---

[1] The emergence of a fundamentally new ecological situation should not, I think, be equated with individual negative processes, e.g., environmental pollution, despite all their unquestioned importance. A systems approach should take into account the totality of ecological factors: pollution of the atmosphere, hydrosphere and soil, fresh-water and cultivated land balance, food production, consumption of finite natural resources and, lastly, stabilisation of global and regional ecological systems and the conditions for reproduction of their central link, their "master"-man.

[2] After repeated appeals by scientists, journalists, public and political leaders, discussion of the fundamental questions of man's interaction with nature was begun at international forums. Thus, in June 1972 a UN-sponsored conference in Stockholm adopted a Declaration on the Environment, setting out the principles and goals of environmental protection, and an Action Plan for international co-operation in protecting the environment and natural resources.

Marxist scientists were among the first to discuss every aspect of the new ecological situation. Mention might be made of the international symposium, Marxism-Leninism and the Problems of Preserving the Environment, held in Prague in March 1972. A report of the symposium, "Ecology and Politics", was put out by the Prague Peace and Socialism publishers in 1972.

[3] D. L. and D. H. Meadows, Eds. *Toward Global Equilibrium*, Collected Papers, Cambridge, Mass., 1973; D. L. Meadows, et al., *Dynamics of Growth in a Finite World*, Cambridge, Mass., 1974.

[4] D. L. Meadows, et al. *The Limits to Growth*, New York, 1972.

[5] H. Cole, et al. (Eds.). *Thinking About the Future—a Critique of the Limits to Growth*, London, 1974.

[6] Mihajlo Mesarovic and Eduard Pestel. *Mankind at the Turning Point*. The Second Report to the Club of Rome. New York, 1974.

[7] Latin American World Model (Preliminary Report). Buenos-Aires, 1974.

[8] Yoichi Kaya and Yutaka Suzuki. *Global Constraints and a New Vision for Development*, 1. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, Vol. 6, No. 3, 1974, pp. 277-297.

[9] "Problems of Population Doubling."

[10] DEMATEL—Decision Making Trial and Evaluation Laboratory. For the latest projects see: M. Siebker and Y. Kaya. The Club of Rome Report from Tokyo. Toward a Global Vision of Human Problems. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, Vol. 6, No. 3, 1974, pp. 231-260.

[11] The population of the socialist countries is treated as a single group.

[12] "Reshaping the International Order", NY, 1976.

[13] Environmental problems, the use of natural resources, and development strategy were discussed in October 1974 at a symposium in Cocoyoc, Mexico, sponsored by UNCTAD and UNEP. A declaration was approved emphasising the need to supervise the use of natural resources and environmental protection on a global scale in order to protect the interests of the most underdeveloped countries and of future generations.

[14] Significantly, one of the latest models, "Goals for Global Society" worked out by a group under Professor Laszlo, who works in the USA, directly links much of the environmental pollution to the ethics and aims of capitalist society. It suggests minimal changes in values which would markedly "humanise" the world order. (For the methodology used in this project, see E. Laszlo, "A Strategy for the Future. The Systems Approach to World Order", NY, 1974. A. K. Bocast and A. J. Fedanzo, Jr., "Goals for Global Society. Third Generation Project for the Club of Rome". *Technological Forecast and Social Change*, 1975, Vol. 7, No. 3, pp. 327-330.

[15] An assessment of the general theoretical aspects of global models will be found in a number of works by Soviet scientists, e.g., V. Zagladin and I. Frolov, "Global Problems of Our Time", *Kommunist*, 1976, No. 16, pp. 93-104.

[16] See A. D. Smirnov "The System of Simulated Economic Decisions", *Economics and Mathematical Methods*, 1973, Vol. IX, No. 3, pp. 395-406; G. I. Belchansky, et al., "Methodological Aspects of the Construction of Simulated Models of Natural Resources and the Tasks of Global Modelling". In Reports of the 23rd International Geographical Congress, Vol. 8, *Regional Geography*, Moscow, 1976, pp. 230-234.

[17] K. G. Gofman, M. Y. Lemeshev, N. F. Reimers, "Social and Economic Problems of the Use of the Natural Resources". In *Economics and Mathematical Methods*, 1973, Vol. IX, No. 5, pp. 812-822.

[18] K. A. Bagrinovsky, M. Y. Lemeshev, "On Economic Development Planning, With Account of Ecological Requirements", ibid., 1976, Vol. XII, No. 4, pp. 681-691.

Winds of Detente Over Asia

THE historic achievements of the movement for peace and detente in Europe and the successful outcome of the Helsinki Conference on Security and Co-operation made it possible to raise in practical terms the issue of extending detente to other areas of our planet. In Asia, more and more countries join actively in this highly important international process; numerous politicians and other public figures of the continent today advocate detente. Our correspondent has asked several participants in the Asian Peace Conference (Ulan

Bator, Mongolian People's Republic) to comment on the reasons for the popularity of the idea of detente in Asia and define the principal requisites of materialising it, as well as to point out the difficulties attending the struggle for peace and security on the continent. Following are their answers as recorded by Satiadjaja Sudiman, representative of the Communist Party of Indonesia on the journal.

Vital Necessity

Sjahrul Munir, Vice-Chairman, Indonesian Peace Committee. Our time is marked by a great change in the peoples' social consciousness. On entering the last quarter of the twentieth century, mankind became more aware of the need for peace than ever before. More important still, mankind is now certain that the peoples and states of the planet can coexist peacefully. The road to this goal is universally considered to be international detente. The idea of detente is now spreading to all continents, nor is Asia an exception.

As far as Asia's peoples are concerned, the reasons for so deep a change in their thinking are self-evident.

First of all, the desire for detente is a natural reaction to the recent past, when enormous damage was caused to Asian peoples by colonialist and neocolonialist policies. These peoples have gone through too much suffering in the past decades—war and imperialist intervention have left deep wounds. Asia may safely be said to have arrived at the idea of detente the hard way.

Secondly, now that many Asian countries have won national sovereignty, the issue of new forms of relations between them, of staving off the threat of armed conflict and eliminating survivals of the past, is particularly pressing. A vigorous quest for ways and means of creating a favourable international climate on the continent has been going on to this day. And detente turns out to be entirely in harmony with these objectives.

Lastly, there is no discounting so obvious a phenomenon as the rapid democratisation of international relations that has been taking place in recent decades. In striving for a reshaping of relations between states on the principles of equality and mutual benefit, Asian countries know very well that detente is giving a new powerful spur to this process.

Ali Aksad, General Secretary, Bangladesh Peace Council. In spite of the intricacies of the struggle to implement the noble ideas of peace and co-operation on the Asian continent, the severe trials that have befallen many of our countries, above all through the fault of imperialism and its domestic agents (let us recall the assassination of President Mujibur Rahman of Bangladesh), we are looking ahead with optimism. We are now heartened by the example of Europe. The struggle for detente in Europe, that arena of the sharpest confrontation of the two opposed social systems, has made certain headway towards detente. I feel that a similar change is also bound to occur in Asia, where most countries badly need peace as a key condition for their economic and social progress. Like the states of Europe, those of Asia should come to terms on the principles of their mutual relations. They cannot end their lag if tension, hostility or a situation of "neither war, nor peace" persists. For us peace and economic progress are indivisible.

Gamini Fernando, Sri Lanka Peace Committee. It is now much clearer than ever how the Asian political climate can be improved. To begin with, an end

must be put to the military and political presence of imperialism. That would lessen tensions and strengthen the sovereignty of peoples and states. The dismantling of all imperialist military bases would be a tremendous step forward. The Indian Ocean should become a peace zone. It is our duty to defeat the plans of international reaction and counter its every plot, in particular those aimed at destabilising democratic and progressive governments.

To achieve tangible results in the effort for a relaxation of tensions in Asia, it is essential to encourage political, economic and cultural contacts between our countries. The combined strength of Asian countries will grow, and their dependence on imperialism will diminish, as co-operation unfolds. By relying on one another for support, they could cope all the more effectively with the problem of ending their lag and reorganising their national economies.

What Hinders Detente

Keyhan Mehdi, Vice-Chairman, Peace Committee of Iran. Speaking of ways of establishing new relations between Asian countries, of materialising detente, it is important to remember that success hinges to a substantial degree on what forces are in power in the country concerned. The principles of peaceful coexistence and equality in international relations are upheld most consistently by the countries building socialism or socialist-orientated. A noteworthy example is socialist Vietnam, which was the first to hold out the olive branch to other Southeast Asian countries. In that way it demonstrated both its own peaceful intentions and its desire to remove the heavy burden of the past weighing on relations with neighbours. That burden is not so very small, as we all know, for several states of the region took part in the US aggression against Vietnam.

The attitude of reactionary regimes to international affairs is different. Their foreign policy, a continuation of their home policy, is prompted by a bid for hegemony and a close military political alliance with imperialist powers. This applies, in particular, to the policy of Iran's rulers, who have made the country a trusted partner of imperialism, first of all US imperialism. They try with the aid of arms lavishly supplied by Washington to dominate the Persian Gulf and check the revolutionary liberation movement. This policy is undoubtedly most dangerous for detente.

Sjahrul Munir. We are witnessing inconsistencies in the peace policy of certain Asian governments and sometimes even attempts to revive the cold war spirit. Such is, for example, the policy of the present Thai rulers, who came to power through a military coup in October 1976. It is plain that they could not accept the development of new relations between Southeast Asian countries based on the principles of peaceful coexistence.

Or take another fact. The Indonesian regime has for years protested its allegiance to the policy of peace and peaceful coexistence. But what we have in reality is the forcible annexation of Eastern Timor to Indonesia. That move has hardly made for a normal situation in Southeast Asia or greater mutual confidence in the region. A number of countries were also deeply concerned by the fact that official Indonesia had accepted, if with reservations, the idea of maintaining a definite "power balance" in the Indian Ocean until conditions were ripe for transforming it into a peace zone. This attitude found expression in a joint communique at the close of a visit to Indonesia by

Malcolm Fraser, the Australian Prime Minister. It certainly suits those whc want continued US military presence in the region, especially the leadershi of the ANZUS bloc.

And now for a further example. Official Jakarta likes to stress its allegianc to the idea of making Southeast Asia a neutral region and expresses it negative stand on military blocs. Yet, certain Indonesian quarters try tc supplement economic co-operation through ASEAN with military co-opera tion, which smacks very strongly of a bloc strategy. A zealot of the idea i Prime Minister Thanin Kraivichien of Thailand, who late in 1976 toured som Southeast Asian countries and tried to win their support for a contemplate military pact based on ASEAN. However, the results of his visit indicate tha nowadays the idea of blocs is anything but popular in our region.

The facts I have listed should serve as a warning to the peace forces. W cannot pin all our hopes on high-sounding official statements about fidelity tc peace. It is more important to make rulers keep their promises. Democrati opinion and popular movements have a tremendous role to play in achievin this aim. Progressives and democrats must offer their countries a specifi programme of struggle for peace, security and detente on the continent.

Looking Forward to a Peaceful Future

Gamini Fernando. Our most important task is to prepare public opinio for the acceptance and appreciation of the struggle for detente. People shoulc know that this is not only an international matter, but very much a domesti one linked, first of all, with problems of national progress and renaissance. Ir Sri Lanka, our Committee is doing a great deal for public opinion to embrac the idea of struggle for the security and co-operation of peoples and states Active peace supporters explain the Committee's objectives to their com patriots and encourage their effort to know more about the movement. It i also quite important that Sri Lanka's leading quarters, for their part, favou the idea of establishing a climate of co-operation and mutual confidence ir Asia. Active in the non-aligned movement, our country is campaigning alon with many other non-aligned countries to promote detente and extend it tc Asia and other areas of the globe.

Keyhan Mehdi. The vast movement for detente on the Asian continen encompasses not only public opinion and the masses, but also man governments.

After the Soviet Union, which put forward the idea of extending detente tc Asia, the governments of a number of other big and influential countries o the continent took important peace initiatives that have had widesprea repercussions in Asia and elsewhere. More and more Asian countries show a desire for peace, co-operation and good-neighbourliness. Co-ordinated actio at the highest level is gaining in importance as the struggle for detente con tinues. Life itself gradually brings home to sober-minded politicians that it i indispensable to join efforts to ease tensions and spread detente to ou continent.

In this context, the idea of setting up a collective security system in Asia i particularly important. The system could comprise all the states of the con tinent, which would enable everyone of them to create reliable internationa guarantees of its independent, sovereign existence. The idea of collectiv

security has been looked upon optimistically in Asia since the Helsinki Conference and Indochina victories. Peace supporters are greatly encouraged by what the Soviet Union, that mighty socialist power, does to make peace a reality.

Dulal Chandra Khound. All-India Peace and Solidarity Organisation. We can probably speak already of concrete ways of putting this noble idea into effect. I believe a beginning could be made through bilateral and multilateral talks between Asian countries to reach understanding and work out a common approach to problems of security and co-operation. The situation now shaping up here is favourable to this effort, all the more since some countries, such as India, have shown a desire to normalise relations with their neighbours and establish closer links with other Asian countries and, besides, have made some headway along these lines.

All consistent peace supporters on our continent realise that success in the struggle for detente depends to no small extent on the state of relations between socialist and developing countries. Their progress and consolidation are both an important prerequisite of economic progress in one-time colonies and a peace factor in Asia and other parts of the planet.

We in India take an active part in all international campaigns aimed at curbing the arms race and the forces of reaction and war. In my native state, Assam, as in others, the campaign to collect signatures to the new Stockholm Appeal has scored big gains. Translated into Assamese, it was circulated among political parties and mass organisations. The Appeal was signed by all state ministers, by party and trade union leaders, intellectuals and numerous working people. All this is evidence of our people's strong desire for peace.

Sunarath Deuane, Deputy Minister of the Interior, Laotian People's Democratic Republic. The peace policy championed by the progressive and democratic forces of Asian countries has nothing to do with pacifism. When US imperialism resorts to aggression our peoples retaliate with armed resistance. As we know, this struggle is fully appreciated by the socialist countries and all progressive forces of the world, which help freedom fighters by word and deed. The Laotian people know this from their own experience of thirty years' struggle against imperialism, twenty of which were taken up with resistance to US aggression.

But for us the war was never an end in itself. We always sought a fair peace. Such a peace implies respect for the principles of independence and national sovereignty, non-use of force or of the threat of force, the principles of peaceful coexistence. The socialist countries, whose ranks a free Laos has now joined, invariably set an example of this. We are campaigning for the application of these principles in our relations with neighbours and other Asian countries. Strict adherence to them is the sure way to spread detente to the Asian continent.

The Dominican Republic: Problems and Prospects

PEDRO JUAN PERSIA
Central Committee member, Dominican Communist Party

THE Third National Conference of the Dominican Communist Party, held in Santo Domingo last December, discussed and approved the report of the Central Committee which analysed the country's economic and political situation and summed up the basic development trends in 1973-76. It examined the changes in the regime and in the opposition, the sources of the growing contradictions within the ruling faction, assessed the present struggle against the multinational monopolies, which are plundering our national resources, and stressed the importance of the forthcoming elections and of the nascent process of realignment of social and political forces.

The record of 1976 makes it clear that the economic improvement of the past two years has not prevented aggravation of the country's social ills, which affect the majority of its population, nor resolved its serious economic problems. The growth factors of the past two years no longer operate: growth of gross national product has steadily declined from an annual average of 11.2 per cent in 1969-73 to 8.9 per cent in 1974 and to only 6.2 per cent in 1975.

The drop in world prices of sugar, combined with rising fuel prices, a steadily increasing foreign debt, dearer international loans, and an unfavourable ratio between foreign investment and profit export by the multinationals, are impeding development. And this is attended by still greater economic dependence on foreign countries, stagnation in agriculture, and growing concentration of property and incomes.

It has become perfectly clear that an economic policy founded entirely, or mainly, on the uncontrolled inflow of foreign investment has proved utterly ineffectual and is contrary to the widespread demand for independent development.

All available data point to the deteriorating structural crisis. Thus, the foreign debt increased from $158.1 million in 1966 to $794.1 million on May 31, 1976. Last year's balance of payments deficit topped the $300 million mark. Export of profits has been running ahead of the inflow of new direct investments: in 1973 they amounted to $34.5 million, while profit exports amounted to 79.7 million, and the figures for 1974 are respectively 53.6 and 94.9 million.

There is relative stagnation in agriculture, the mainstay of the economy. The following figures are indicative of the sharp social contradictions in our rural areas. A large part of the farmland is being used for extensive cattle raising (2 million taeras[1]); 3.4 per cent of landowners account for 62.5 per cent of latifundia lands which produce either very little or nothing at all, while 86.2 per cent of the peasant farms have a mere 19.3 per cent of the farmland. The result has been a constantly decreasing volume of agricultural produce for the home market, and there is now the danger of a food shortage.

Concentration of property and, consequently, of profits, has reached menacing proportions. Only 6 per cent of the population enjoy a monthly income of more than 300 pesos, 50 per cent of the rural population live on the border of poverty, with a monthly income of less than 60 pesos, or only 13 per cent of total income. Unemployment now stands at an average of 20 per cent and in rural areas is as high as 45 per cent. In other words, 75 per cent of Dominicans cannot afford even a minimum of essential foods.

If the situation does not change, the inevitable result will be accentuation of all the negative trends: continued inflation, concentration of incomes, unemployment, pauperisation of the working people, greater dependence on foreign countries, a larger balance of payments deficit and, of course, a much larger foreign debt. This will drastically cut the economic growth rates of the past few years. The economy is being sustained mainly by foreign loans and more foreign investments. In the long-term, both are bound to exacerbate all our social ills, and will certainly not prevent continued deepending of the economic crisis.

Recent years have seen significant changes in the alignment of political forces. Since 1972, the Balaguer government has been following a reformist policy. Signs of a tendency opposed to the traditional policy of the oligarchy can be seen, in particular, in a series of draft laws generally known as "The Agrarian Code of the Balaguer Government". Some have been rejected by Congress, but the very fact that they were put before Congress is, in the opinion of the Communist Party, indicative of the sharp contradiction between government policy and the interests of the right-wing forces who have supported the president since 1966. The latifundist oligarchy desperately resisted government measures to resolve the agricultural crisis. The big landowners were dead set against changes in land tenure, and this precipitated a split in the ruling Reformist Party. Publication of the draft agrarian laws was followed by an unprecedented rise of the peasant movement.

Tension rose especially in 1973, when Balaguer put before Congress two other draft laws. One of them envisaged transfer to the agrarian-reform fund of the unused pasture lands owned by the big landholders. The other draft law, which likewise encountered fierce resistance from the reactionary elements, provided for legislation of the Communist Party. Both drafts were shelved. The rightist elements accused the government of dangerous "condonation" of the Communists. Julian Perez, a leading right-winger, resigned from the government, which was being pressured also by the extreme right-wing officers who had by this time won key posts in the armed forces.

In an effort to incite confusion in the country and thus create a favourable climate for a coup d'etat, on March 17, 1975, the plotters assassinated Orlando Martinez, one of the leaders of our Party and editor of the popular magazine *Ahora*, on the pages of which he had exposed the plans for a fascist coup. This aroused a nation-wide protest which the ultra-rightists, both civilian and military, least of all expected. The impressive scope of this protest against political terror had very unfavourable consequences for the opponents of even the most timid reforms contemplated by the government. In particular. President Balaguer was obliged to remove some of the high-ranking military and police officials and replace them by more loyal and moderate ones.

These measures, as the government's policy in general, were of a dual,

decisions did not preclude repeated ultra-right actions. In fact, the pro-fascist elements still hold important positions in the government machine and have the support both of the reactionary forces at home and of definite institutions and services in the United States. Nonetheless, the changes that have taken place in the country are more favourable for political activity and tend to dull the neofascist menace, facilitate reforms and strengthen unity of the democratic and patriotic forces.

There have been changes also in the opposition line-up. On the eve of the 1974 elections, the right-wing opposition to President Balaguer united in a number of coalitions to form a motley conglomerate of reactionary forces, including the latifundist oligarchy affected by the government reforms, supporters of retired General Elias Wessin y Wessin, who in 1965 led the troops which, together with the US interventionists, fought the constitutionalists, and many smaller right-wing groups and parties. But after the elections most of them sided with the government, as the Communists had foreseen, thus demonstrating their complete political insolvency.

The opposition is now made up of such parties as the fragmented and largely passive Dominican Popular Movement which has yet to formulate a clear-cut policy, and the Dominican Liberation Party headed by Juan Bosch. Its distinguishing features are bourgeois-democratic narrow-mindedness, a policy of compromise and the absence of any consistent programme on basic social-economic issues. Also in the opposition is the Dominican Revolutionary Party, which has wide popular support. However, following on a series of major errors and an unprincipled policy of alliance with the right forces, it is now in a state of deep crisis. Furthermore, the presence in its leadership of elements closely associated with the big commercial and landed interests restricts, if not to say prevents, its participation in the anti-imperialist and anti-latifundist struggle.

The outlook for further political action and deep-going structural changes depend not on this "opposition", but rather on the formation of a new socio-political movement capable of giving voice to the aspirations of the people, implementing a radical agrarian reform and abolishing dependence on foreign countries. Only such a movement can stimulate social reforms within the state apparatus, secure complete sovereignty over our natural resources, and unite all the civilian and military forces prepared to fight the local oligarchy and the foreign monopolies.

Only by extending and deepening the struggle for the right to dispose of our, now foreign-controlled, national wealth, the working class struggle against capitalist oppression, the peasant struggle against the big landed interests, the struggle against corruption and political terror, can we secure united action of the various parties and social groups. And only practical activity can bring about such unity, which accords with historical necessity and with the present trends of social development. In the past there was identity of positions on such issues as the predatory activities of the multinationals, on combating the political crimes of the ruling rightist groups, and on latifundism.

There was united action by the trade unions, a number of opposition parties, peasant associations, military elements, members of the government,

officials and specialists in the government service, against foreign companies, and also in the anti-feudal struggle and the campaign of protest against the assassination of Orlando Martinez. These groups also united, though in varying degree of consistency, on several other issues.

Such joint action on a widening range of national problems can produce a situation that would alter the existing pattern of political development, lead to the formation of a new alliance, make it possible to win power with the support of the masses, and pave the road to national and social liberation of our people.

Though the perspective is for continued aggravation of the crisis of the existing system, the government is still in a position to chart a new course in its economic and social policy.

This is borne out by some of its actions in recent years. The agrarian laws, changes in contractual relations with the big mining companies, hydro-power projects, the establishment of state farms to boost the production of vegetables and other foods, the socially important "rice law" envisaging the transfer to the agrarian reform fund of all rice plantations serviced by the state-owned irrigation system, abortive attempts to freeze prices—these and several other measures, despite their modest scope and restricted implementation, were the result of the objective requirements of economic development and were designed to moderate the more negative consequences of the crisis.

However, so far, these necessary changes have largely remained promises, the reforms were never carried out, enacted laws were not put into practice, and even the timid measures proposed by government commissions and technical specialists were later shelved.

If the government had been more consistent in carrying out these reform measures, it would have been possible, at least to a certain extent, to moderate the crisis and ease the heavy burden borne by the poorest sections of the people.

This would have opened the way to more profound changes that could remove the causes of the structural crisis. What the Communist Party has proposed amounts to a programme of fundamental change of existing social and economic structures and abolition of all dependence on foreign capitalism. A programme of deep-going change must include the following essential measures:

— nationalisation of foreign companies especially Alcoa, Flaconbridge, Rosario Resource, Simplot and Gulf and Western, the oil refinery and the telephone company:

— accelerated enforcement of existing agrarian laws, effective application of the law on pasture lands; complete repeal of share-cropping and stimulation of collective farming and fair distribution of farm incomes; transfer of the Agricultural Bank to the Dominican Agrarian Institute;

— strengthening of the state sector as a key national asset;

— transfer to the state of the entire fertiliser industry;

— transfer to the state of all service enterprises;

— nationalisation of foreign banks;

— gradual transfer to the state of foreign trade, and other measures.

While supporting all, even the most restricted, measures towards these aims, our Party has no intention of abandoning its efforts to bring to power a

regime capable of energetically carrying out deep-going structural changes. Though the points enumerated above are not a complete and final plan of social transformations, they can serve as the basis for working out a programme of our country's transition to socialism. That will require more vigorous efforts and effective co-operation with representatives of the revolutionary intelligentsia and all the people in order to mobilise the forces of social change, so needed by our country.

And these forces include the working class, peasantry, marginal strata, low-income urban strata—in short, everyone concerned for the future of our country, everyone holding patriotic positions, believers and non-believers, civilians and servicemen. These are the strata committed to resolving the social, political and economic problems confronting our society.

The Dominican Communist Party has made significant headway in its campaign for legalisation. It has scored considerable success despite the fact that the draft law on legalisation, which the president presented to Congress, has not been enacted. We are factually bringing it into force.

Our constructive part in the nation-wide discussion of crucial problems has visibly enhanced our Party's prestige. The next task is to win full legality and restore our political and electoral rights and put an end to all discrimination against those who hold Marxist-Leninist views.

Experience has taught us that we do not have to wait for the adoption of some special law. The restrictions we have overcome and those still operative under anti-Communist laws 6, 70 and 71, are in crying contradiction to such constitutional principles as freedom of speech, organisation and ideology. The Communist Party has decided to take advantage of these principles, and by direct action surmount all obstacles and enforce all the constitutional rights enjoyed by every legal party. This means holding conferences, open meetings and rallies to explain our position to the masses.

The Dominican Communists will openly and publicly carry out all these measures. More, they are prepared to discuss their policy and take part in the democratic struggle. This does not rule out participation in elections. On the contrary, in view of the elections appointed for 1978, and the start of the election campaign, and though fully aware of the limited character and defects of these elections, we have expressed our readiness to take part in them in order to uphold the interests of the working people and explain and popularise the Communist Party programme on the pressing problems facing the country.

[1] A taera = 632 square metres.—*Ed.*

The Press

Time of Maturity

"The International Working-Class Movement. Questions of History and Theory." In seven volumes. B. N. Ponomaryov, Chairman of the Main Editorial Commission. Vol. 2, "The Working Class Movement in the Transition Period to Imperialism (1871-1904)." V. V. Zagladin, editor, Moscow, Mysl Publishers, 1976. 654 pp.

THE second volume covers the 33 years separating the Paris Commune from the first Russian revolution, a short span measured in terms of history, but rich in the history-making events that closed the 19th century and opened the 20th. One of its significant features was the new role of the working class, which only a short while ago had been but a silent figure on the stage of history.

Nor should we be dismayed by the fact that Lenin described this as a peaceful period. But, then, the word "peaceful" was always in inverted commas, for these years could be called "peaceful" only if compared with the preceding period of revolutionary storm and, especially, with the succeeding period of imperialism.

The closing third of the last century and the beginning of this one saw capitalism entering its monopoly stage. Those were years of dynamic and deep-going change. There was technological change, a veritable technical revolution, in many industries; centralisation and concentration of industry and capital; completion of the economic and territorial division of the world and of imperialism's colonial system. This was paralleled by the rapid growth of the working class and its organisation and, all the obstacles notwithstanding, intensification of the class struggle.

The second part of this volume (there are four in all) deals with the Paris Commune, the culminating point of the new revolutionary upsurge after the reactionary wave that swept Europe in the 1850s. It is no exaggeration to say that the pages devoted to the Commune are among the best in the volume. And though the Commune has been the subject of a wide literature, the authors, drawing on the works of Marx, Engels and Lenin, have added a new dimension to this epic. In particular, they show why, for all their theoretical immaturity and Blanquist and Proudhonist illusions, the Communards made correct decisions on so many issues. In time of revolution, with the strains it lays on the will and creativity of the masses, there is a certain "levelling out" of ideology. All manner of sectarian socialist schemas and doctrines, utopian and even reactionary, are dissolved in what the authors call the "red alloy" of mass consciousness (p. 136). At such times sincere worker revolutionaries are guided by their class instincts, often rise above their delusions and act, unwittingly perhaps, in accordance with proletarian ideas and Marxist principles.

That is one of the reasons why the Commune's revolutionary creativity, this first experiment in proletarian dictatorship, is of such significance for the international working-class movement of our own time. The *broadest democracy for the working people* was the hallmark of that dictatorship. And that is precisely what Engels had in view when he wrote, on the Commune's 20th anniversary: "Of late, the Social-Democrat philistine has once more been filled with wholesome terror at the words: Dictatorship of the Proletariat. Well and Good, gentlemen, do you want to know what this dictatorship looks like? Look at the Paris Commune. That was the Dictatorship of the Proletariat" (Marx and Engels, *Selected Works*, Vol. 2, p. 189).

The third part traces the development of the working class and socialist movement after the Paris Commune. This was an important period of building up the forces of the proletariat, the rise of its mass struggle, the foundation and strengthening of working-class socialist parties and the formation of new

international ties between the movement's various contingents. It is in this context that the authors examine the history of the Second International which in its heyday made no small contribution to the development of the workers' movement. Its role is analysed from class positions, without bias or simplification, and with due account to historical conditions. There are carefully weighed and substantiated characteristics of some of its leaders. Tribute is paid to Engels's immense theoretical and organisational work after Marx's death. The close link between the working-class movement and the work of the founders of scientific communism shows how Marxist theory stems from reality, from the requirements of the workers' struggle, and how it absorbs the experience of that struggle, and the grim tests it had to pass from its early days.

The Marxists' fight against opportunism, notably against the turn-coat ideas of Bernstein, the father of revisionism, are both interesting and instructive in the light of present-day events. Acquaintance with Bernstein's views will show that in the past 75 years the revisionists have not really invented anything new and are merely repeating the litanies of this first apostle of revisionism, brought to the fore in the age of imperialism.

The core of this second volume is its fourth and biggest part, which deals with the new phase in the international working-class movement and the beginning of the Leninist stage in the development of Marxism. That these subjects have been made the focal point of the study is fully justified and accords with the actual march of history. At the juncture of two centuries, in the transition period to imperialism, the centre of the revolutionary process, as Marx and Engels had foreseen, shifted to Russia, the weakest link of the imperialist system, with its revolutionary movement entering the proletarian stage.

The authors explain the historical reasons for the rise of Leninism: "Answers had to be found to the new problems confronting the international and Russian working-class movement at the turn of the century. Leninism was a direct continuation and creative development of Marxism, based on interpretative generalisation of the experience of the world liberation movement, and forged in battle against all anti-Marxist ideological and theoretical concepts and schools" (p. 332). And facts are cited to support this. The authors examine the new concepts Lenin brought to Marxism: his doctrine of the party of the new type, the strategy and tactics of proletarian revolution which combine the fight for socialism with the fight for democracy, and the principles of proletarian internationalism.

But precisely because Leninism is the historical continuation and development of Marxism in the imperialist epoch, and because Lenin continued the work of Marx and Engels, his contribution to Marxist theory met with fierce opposition from all the opportunist elements. Nor have the attacks on Leninism ceased since then. Perhaps that is why, in leafing through the pages of history, one is led to reflect on the old saying that the new is but the well-forgotten past.

This seven-volume study of the international working-class movement is bound to enjoy a wide readership far beyond the Soviet Union. It will be welcomed by everyone concerned for the destinies of socialism, for knowledge of the past makes for a better understanding of the present and for a truer vision of the future.

* * *

The high theoretical and scientific level of this study is, in the opinion of this reviewer, part of the general growth of Soviet historiography. As in the first volume, the group that compiled this one draws on the large fund of recent research, which has brought to light many little-known pages of working-class history.

L. Sheldin

Unity for Victory

Octavio Pato, *Pela democracia, pelo socialismo* (Textos da clandestinidade e discursos, 1974-1976). (For Democracy and Socialism: Articles and Speeches of the Period of Illegality, 1974-1976.) Lisbon, Edicoes "Avante!", 1976, 275 pp.

THE "Avante!" Publishing House has brought out *For Democracy and Socialism*, a collection of articles and speeches by Octavio Pato, member of the Political Commission and Secretariat of the CC PCP.

The collection opens with a speech delivered almost a quarter of a century ago and closes with a statement made when, in May 1976, the PCP nominated Octavio Pato for the Presidency. Throughout those years, O. Pato championed the Party line of setting up a broad anti-fascist front. The articles and speeches of the period of fascist dictatorship are inspired by the idea of strengthening both the Party's own organisations and all legal, semi-legal and illegal democratic organisations, without which the anti-fascist movement could not have won.

Speaking to a Central Committee meeting in December 1952, O. Pato pointed to the shortcomings in the Communists' work in legal youth organisations. He criticised the fallacious view held by some leaders of the Movement for the Democratic Unity of Youth (MUDJ) at the time that very many members of these legal organisations were "out and out fascists". O. Pato called for effort to persuade young men and women from these organisations to co-operate with the MUDJ in such causes common to all young Portuguese as the struggle for peace, against the danger of a new war, against unemployment and illiteracy (p. 48).

The articles on problems of organising the peasant movement are further evidence of the author's effort to help the Party in strengthening its links with the masses. Working for the implementation of the PCP decision to form peasant unity commissions everywhere as a "natural form of organising and mobilising the peasants in the struggle for bread, land, peace and democracy" (p. 55), O. Pato stressed that commissions set up secretly, without the knowledge of the masses, were organisations lacking vitality and doomed to disappear, for, operating without popular support, they would become an easy prey of the fascists' repressive machinery.

The establishment of a broad anti-fascist front was inconceivable without active work by the Party among Catholic working people. "It is beyond question," O. Pato wrote, "that the Communist Party, being the vanguard of

the working class, must firmly resist the division of the Portuguese, especially the proletariat, into believers and atheists" (p. 72). He stressed that the Party had always championed, and would champion, the broadest possible freedoms, including religious freedom (p. 227).

The Communist Party attached special importance to work in the trade unions. The collection gives the reader an idea of the scope and forms of this work, as a result of which the Party was able to mobilise the masses for major political actions and, "in dozens of trade unions, lackeys in the service of the government and fascism were removed from the leadership to make way for elected workers dedicated to their class" (p. 112).

The Party urged its members to work in the army so as to bring "soldiers and sailors, sergeants and officers, all genuine patriots of the armed forces", into the anti-fascist struggle. A powerful political army of this kind, O. Pato wrote, will be able to end colonial wars, overthrow the fascist dictatorship and win democratic freedoms (p. 130). Developments proved him right.

The task of strengthening anti-fascist unity remained valid after the dictatorship had been toppled. Speaking to numerous rallies held by the PCP, O. Pato stressed again and again that "to all genuine revolutionaries and democrats both military men and civilians, irrespective of ideology . . . or party allegiance it is becoming clearer and clearer that disunity of the progressive forces can only benefit reaction" (p. 201).

The collection is indicative of the manifold activities of a veteran Communist giving his all to the struggle for the people's happiness. It is also a valuable source of data on the history of the PCP, a party which made an immense contribution to the overthrow of Europe's oldest fascist regime and is now fighting for a democratic, independent and free Portugal, for its advance in a socialist direction.

Vladimir Lobe

Against the Power of the Multinationals

Werner Cieslak. *Gegen die Macht der "Multis". Zusammenarbeit der Gewerkschaften in Europa.* Nachrichten-Verlags-GmbH, Frankfurt/Main, 1976. 211 pages.

THIS book, "Against the Power of the Multinationals, European Trade Union Co-operation", is the first major study from the pen of Werner Cieslak, a former sailor and now a member of the Executive and Secretariat of the German Communist Party. It has been put out by the West-German Nachrichten Verlag, which specialises in Marxist economic and social literature.

The power of the multinationals can be gauged by the fact that "a relatively small number—from 200 to 300—giant corporations control the most modern and dynamic branches of the capitalist economy" (p. 5). The fate of a country's

major industries is often decided outside that country (p. 10). This alone, the author remarks, underlines the need for co-ordinated international trade union action.

The multinationals' drive for profits brings them into an irreconcilable and sharpening conflict with the blue-collar and white-collar workers, the people and a definite section of the bourgeoisie. Subordinating the economy to the profit drive impedes the development of the main productive force, man. "Oppression of the individual is an inevitable concomitant of unhindered multinational expansion" (p. 18). Understandably, the book discusses, in several special chapters, the ruinous effect of the multinationals' activity in West Germany and within the European Economic Community.

Cieslak reminds his readers that the Eighth World WFTU Congress (1973) called for energetic efforts to work out a concrete plan of international trade union co-operation against the multinationals. The Orientation Document adopted at the Congress indicated the direction of this struggle, and the Varna Trade Union Charter of Rights recommended such measures as co-ordinated demands, including the demand for state control over the multinationals right down to their nationalisation, and also the organisation of a regular exchange of information.

The congresses of the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions (ICFTU) and the International Metal Workers' Union likewise came out against the multinational monopolies. But one should bear in mind, the author says, that their radical-sounding resolutions are often followed by inconsistent policies largely influenced by reformist elements.

The 1975 Geneva trade union conference on Humanisation of Working Conditions was a vivid example of the development of a unitary process in the European trade union movement. It was attended by representatives of 44 national union centres in 27 European countries and by observers from the WFTU, ICFTU and the World Union of Employed Persons (WUEP).

"The success or failure of the trade union struggle for the interests of the working people," the author emphasises, "is determined by the level of united action" (p. 13). The confrontation with the multinationals requires steady strengthening of international solidarity and trade union co-operation. And Cieslak devotes much space to concrete examples of such co-operation. He examines in detail the importance of co-operation with trade unions of the socialist countries, exposes the anti-Communist diatribes that are hampering consistent defence by all the trade unions of the working people's interests.

The supplement (which accounts for nearly half of the book) will undoubtedly be read with interest. For it contains policy statements by the Federation of German Trade Unions and by the main international trade union organisations, setting out their position in the fight against the multinational corporations. It also contains a survey of national and international trade union federations and a list of the 100 top capitalist concerns.

What conclusions does the author draw from his study?

First, the activity of the multinationals has brought home to the working class and its trade unions the continuing aggravation of the main contradiction of the capitalist system, the contradiction between labour and capital. The understanding is gaining ground that the struggle against these capitalist giants must be waged both on a national and international scale.

Second, trade unions of widely differing orientation are coming to see the negative social, economic and political consequences of the multinational assault on the living standards, rights and conditions of the working class.

Third, there is closer understanding between the WFTU, the ICFTU and the WUEP on the current and long-range aims of the struggle.

Fourth, experience has proved the efficacy of such forms and methods of struggle as organisation of committees composed of representatives of all the trade union organisations involved; regular exchange of information about the intentions and plans of the multinationals; protest and solidarity meetings and other actions to mobilise public opinion; rejection of overtime work (if there is a strike at one or more factories of the given concern), sit-in and work-in strikes.

Matthias Dohmen

Scanning the Periodicals

Uruguay: The People Fight Back

A SPECIAL issue of the magazine *Casa de las Americas* describes the grave situation and growing popular struggle in Uruguay and calls for stronger international solidarity with this struggle.

"The terrible events in Chile which resulted in President Allende's death in the battle and the temporary interruption of the revolutionary process attracted the attention of the world and gave rise to growing resistance," the leading article says in part. "The equally terrible events in Uruguay likewise require such attention and such resistance. The Uruguay of these past years has justly been called a 'silent Chile'. The extraordinary similarity of the two situations is due to the fact that they are embodiments of one and the same fascist policy which imperialism tries to pursue throughout America in a desperate attempt to keep alive. We consider, therefore, that the crimes of the Uruguayan government must be denounced as vigorously and steadfastly as those of the Chilean government, and that in both cases their connection with sinister imperialist designs must be pointed out" (pp. 2-3).

The latest events have brought out more than ever the tragic outlines of the Uruguayan drama and at the same time added some bright spots of well-founded hope to a sombre panorama. The fact is that the Uruguayan drama is daily becoming less "silent". News of crimes against Uraguayans and of their suffering, and the anger aroused by the news, echo throughout the world. The growing militancy of a people wounded in the heart yet fighting on, of a people who, despite the terror, are unbroken in their fight for democracy, is more and more evident. What *Casa de las Americas* has published in its special issue helps to swell the ranks of fighters for democracy, step up the solidarity movement, increase varied and effective aid, and focus attention on Latin American anti-fascism as an urgent international problem.

The magazine carries the answers of Rodney Arismendi, First Secretary of the CC, Communist Party of Uruguay, to the editors' questions about

repressive measures used by the dictatorship, the economic and social situation in the country, and likely ways of ending the nightmare its people are passing through. Arismendi stresses the need to intensify popular resistance, strengthen and extend the unity of anti-fascist forces and rally them around a common action programme. As elsewhere in Latin America, he writes, "our fight will be protracted, severe and difficult". Nevertheless, Latin American fascism, that "product of US imperialism . . . will be defeated". The forces of "internationalist and democratic solidarity", whose chief exponents are the Soviet Union, Cuba and other socialist countries, Arismendi points out, play a tremendous role in the anti-fascist struggle along with the resistance movement at home (p. 11).

The magazine also contains interesting articles on the culture, education and the intellectual in the climate of fascist obscurantism. Contributions by Oscar J. Magiolo, engineer, former rector of Montevideo University, and by writers and journalists give an idea of the dimensions of the cultural genocide the Uruguayan dictatorship is methodically carrying out. Noted Uruguayan artists combine their artistic effort with a critical attitude to Uruguayan reality, an attitude that is partisan and prompted by a sense of civic responsibility. This is seen in the contributions of Juan Carlos Onetti, Mario Benedetti and other Uruguayan authors.

A number of items in *Casa de las Americas* depict the people's anti-fascist struggles. They tell about the Broad Front, the Communist Party, and the tortures in fascist prisons.

The magazine's editors rightly stress that the struggle to defeat Uruguayan fascism is "a prime duty towards the noble and courageous people of Uruguay" (p. 3).

The appearance of the *Casa de las Americas* issue devoted to Uruguay is an important contribution to this struggle.

Sergio Sierra

Purveyors of Lies

Notes on the Methods of the Bourgeois Mass Media

FOR almost two years after the Helsinki Conference, the bourgeois mass media virtually turned a deaf ear to the Final Act's appeal to disseminate "an ever wider knowledge and understanding of the various aspects of life in other participating states". Far from contributing "to the strengthening of peace and understanding among peoples and to the spiritual enrichment of the human personality", they operated against this fundamental principle proclaimed in the "third basket" of the Helsinki peace charter.

If imperialist propaganda has done anything in the sphere of international relations, it is essentially negative and is intended to shape them according to the interests of reaction.

The modern propaganda machine of imperialism, which commands powerful facilities using the latest achievements of science and technology, is working at top speed. It repeats battered ideological stereotypes over and over

again, including the myth of "freedom" of the capitalist press. Yet the methods used by the privately owned mass media serve only one purpose, which is to strengthen class rule in a society based on exploitation.

"Service to Society"

Shortly before his death, Lord Thomson published an autobiography called *After I was Sixty*. In it the owner of 148 newspapers, 138 periodicals, many publishing houses and TV stations in Britain, Canada, the United States and elsewhere tells how, at the beginning of his "wholly profit-oriented" career, he "made a big fortune through radio and television and newspapers"[1] and won a high position in finance and business on either side of the Atlantic and the recognition of Britain's ruling quarters, to which the son of a Canadian barber owes his British peerage.

"What we did with our money," Thomson writes, "was to go wide and far, to hunt out opportunities for expansion, to enjoy the real freedom of enterprise."[2] The author's description of "hunting" methods reads like a manual for men in the news business. Having made up his mind to "conquer" Edinburgh, he offered to barter newspapers with Sir Harley Drayton, head of the United Newspapers trust. "I knew exactly," Thomson confides, "what Harley Drayton wanted; he believed like me that a good deal was one in which both sides were satisfied. He genuinely preferred to have no one interfering when he and I were working to that end. That is the face of capitalism which is quite genuine."[3]

In step with his transformation into a multi-millionaire (he estimated the assets of the corporation's Canadian branch alone at £300m), Thomson followed more and more punctually, as he himself admits, the example of "most of the people who owned and ran newspapers in Canada and America and in Britain" and "did so because they liked the prestige and the power that newspaper ownership gave them".[4] He "became very close friends" with successive British prime ministers, leaders of parliament and cabinet ministers, with presidents and heads of government of other capitalist countries, with top men in NATO and the Common Market. "We helped . . . to spread ideas among men of influence and to bring opposing opinions closer together."[5]

Just what sort of ideas Thomson helped to spread is not hard to guess. Every time he turns in his life story to the subject of labour or labour unions, his lines breathe hatred. Peter Preston, reviewing Thomson's autobiography in *The Guardian*, mocks at the lord's attempts to represent his every deal as a charitable act and evidence of heartfelt concern for "freedom of the press". He calls Thomson's methods "warmly grasping by the throat" and the lord himself "a tough, imaginative operator who must have had a battle plan".[6]

Other men like Thomson "serve society" just as "warmly". Henry Luce, founder of Time Inc., stated his political credo in an address to the American Association of Advertising Agencies as follows: "Yours is the only court in the land to which I hold myself accountable. My only law is the concordat between advertiser and editor. . . . This is the very essence of democracy. . . . Whether *Life* will endure depends upon you, the Appropriations Committee of the American Press. . . . It is my firm belief that advertisers not only have the right, but the duty to become inextricably involved with the ethical and cultural standards of the American press."[7]

The "only court", in turn, stints no expenditure to bolster the monopoly press. Last year US big business invested over $10,000m in newspaper advertising, or roughly three-fourths of the newspaper owners' revenue. The lion's share went to the press chains, which account for about 60 per cent of the total circulation of the dailies. Strictly tentative assessments carried out by the Rand Corporation indicated that net profit in the American newspaper industry was 76 per cent higher than the national average for all industries.[8]

Fabulous profits enable the chain owners to buy more newspapers and TV stations. Late in 1976, Samuel Newhouse, owner of a major American media concern, paid $305m in cash for eight newspapers and *Parade* magazine belonging to the Booth Newspapers chain. What makes the aged multi-millionaire grab newspapers in dozens of American cities? "Sam Newhouse," said Philip Hochstein, a Newhouse editor for some time, "never pretended to be a public benefactor. He doesn't claim to be with the people. He's a capitalist."[9]

"The trouble with the newspaper business," writes Thomas Griffith, a former editor of *Life* magazine, in his book *How True*, "is that it is becoming more and more just a business. . . . Newspapers become simply money-making machines. . . . Editors are chosen who will do their jobs without making waves. Such an approach is stultifying to good journalism, as anyone in the business knows. . . . Corporate managers soon free themselves of editors they regard as negative, trouble-making, shrill or otherwise inconvenient."[10]

The ideal editors for monopoly owners are, to quote Lord Thomson, "highly skilled and dedicated professional journalists".[11] It is to men like them, whose convictions are accurately tuned to state monopoly interests, that the press and broadcasting are entrusted.

Theodore White, the American historian, had in mind editors and journalists of this kind when he described New York's information and propaganda machinery as "the largest megaphone and finest brainwashing system the world has ever known".[12]

"Pluralism" of the Media

The colourful variety of the West German news-stands is deceptive, notes Paul Sethe, a liberal-minded bourgeois analyst of that country's mass media. The freedom of the press was fast becoming the freedom of a few hundred rich men to broadcast their opinions. Real diversity of critical opinion had, in the main, given way to the security of the consensus, as West Germany was a society where profitability and competitiveness had become the sole determinants of the fortunes of the press.[13]

By the mid-seventies, 3 per cent of the West German publishers accounted for half the circulation of all dailies. The concentration process in the mass media is continuing, with the Bertelsmann and Springer multi-media complexes striving to take over the more prestigious and profitable newspapers, periodicals, publishing houses, and film production and distribution companies.

Private ownership of radio and television broadcasting is prohibited in the FRG. This is considered a "public" field which must serve all classes and population groups. The eight broadcasting corporations operating in various states of the Federal Republic are expected to be seen as a model of "pluralism" in covering political, economic and cultural problems. Their

statutes contain such lofty principles as the duty to proceed independently and impartially, eschew preference for any particular political philosophy or ideology, promote international understanding, peace and social justice and uphold democratic freedoms.

As commercial advertising through radio and, above all, television increased, West German financial and industrial capital acquired an effective means of influencing the content and ideological trend of broadcasting. This influence was intensified by introducing a system under which supervisory boards of broadcasting corporations are appointed by state governments. Many of these boards are formed on the principle of so-called proportional representation, or according to the distribution of seats among parties in the Landtag concerned, whose members are admittedly elected in violation of the rights of progressive parties.

In a book on the situation in capitalist television, Antony Smith, a noted British producer, stresses that in the FRG, "it has become harder and harder for producers to get jobs carrying any weight unless they enjoy the sponsorship of a powerful political group within the State".[14] There is "a single programme ideology", he adds.

On West German television as, indeed, in the press, the much advertised "pluralism" of ideas and opinions translates itself into purposeful psychological pressure on every social class or stratum to impart a 100 per cent bourgeois mentality and behaviour to everyone.[15]

The promise to work for peace and international understanding turns out to be chauvinistic talk, support for the aims of the military-industrial complex and an effort to whip up cold war hysteria in the interests of the country's more reactionary and militarist quarters and of NATO.

As in West Germany, the bourgeois media in the United States widely publicised "pluralism". They cite numerous facts supposed to prove the existence of pluralism, and refer frequently to so-called liberal press organs, said to contrast sharply with the conservative and even the "moderate" press. Some bourgeois publishers are particularly fond of showing off their alleged liberalism. They include Dorothy Schiff, who has inherited the *New York Post* from her grandfather, co-owner of Kuhn, Loeb & Co. After 37 years of ownership of this most "liberal" daily on the East Coast, Ms. Schiff decided to get rid of it. She took her time choosing a purchaser. In keeping with the tradition of Americans professing liberal views, everyone expected her choice to fall on a like-minded person and, incidentally, there were many in this category who would have liked to buy one of New York's three major dailies. Yet the "lucky winner" turned out to be Rupert Murdoch, the ultra-reactionary publisher of Australian, British and North American gutter newspapers.

The point is not so much the cheque signed by Murdoch (*Newsweek* set it at between $27 and $30 million) as the make-believe liberalism paraded by bourgeois publishers. The average American paper, says *Columbia Journalism Review*, an authority on the American press, is completely conservative. It has no place for a "broader spectrum of opinion" and refuses to keep pace with its readers. As for "bulwarks of liberalism", such as the *New York Times* and *Washington Post*, they are, in fact, "more conservative on many issues than

their readers, and only appear to be far-out in comparison with their 1,748 daily siblings".[16]

Nevertheless, the monopoly media go on posing as a well of "pluralism, choice and diversity" from which you are supposed to be able to draw any ideas and opinions. This "illusion", writes Professor Herbert Schiller of the University of California, is kept up by the "abundance" of mass media in the United States.[17] Indeed, roughly 1,500 dailies, hundreds of periodicals, about 7,000 radio stations and over 1,000 TV stations contribute their share to an avalanche of information. It is not so easy, therefore, to disbelieve those who say this is a source of diversity. "The fact of the matter," Schiller writes, "is that . . . most Americans are basically, though unconsciously, trapped in what amounts to a no-choice information bind. Variety of opinion on foreign and domestic news or, for that matter, local community business, hardly exists in the media. This results essentially from the inherent identity of interests material and ideological, of property-holders (in this case, the private owners of the communications media), and from the monopolistic character of the communications industry in general."[18] The communications monopolies, the professor continues, "offer one version of reality—their own . . . the images and messages they purvey, are, with few exceptions, constructed to achieve similar objectives, which are, simply put, profitability and the affirmation and maintenance of the private-ownership consumer society".[19]

In camouflaging this scheme, a special role is assigned to what Prof. Schiller calls the "myth of neutrality". The media are described—along with Federal legislative, executive and judicial authorities, universities and schools—as impartial, deideologised "nertual agents" "serving everyone impartially and disinterestedly". Corruption among the authorities, misinformation by officials, bias and preconception in the press, as well as other "deviations" are said to be products of human errors and weaknesses. It follows that the country was dragged into the disgraceful Vietnam war owing to the "errors" of President Johnson and his advisers while the "human weaknesses" of certain Republican Party leaders resulted in the Watergate scandal. To be sure, servants of the system who have discredited themselves are criticised and even made to resign, but the system itself with its institutions and values is exempt from criticism.

Life shows, however, that manipulation, however skilful, does not achieve the purposes of imperialist propaganda. In fact, there is a "credibility gap" between the "free press" and a large body of public opinion in the capitalist countries, as many bourgeois authors admit. In these circumstances, Prof. Schiller writes in his latest book, "imperialism has been developing complementary, if not alternate, strategies and instrumentation for safeguarding its unstable and increasingly menaced global positions. The ideological sphere receives ever more attention."[20]

"Freedom of Information", or "Management of News"

Government agencies of the capitalist countries give increasing attention to the ideological sphere. True, many bourgeois apologists contend that the government control mechanism only involves the economy, finance and trade, leaving the spiritual sphere, the "dissemination of ideas", intact. But they no longer sound as confident as in the past.

After holding several editorial jobs in London and being appointed chair-

man of the board of the *Evening Standard*, Charles Wintour wrote a boo! entitled *Pressures on the Press*. Who exerts these pressures? "The mos difficult of all pressures for an editor to withstand," Wintour complains, "i that of news management by practised hands who understand the media an want the paper to give a favourable slant to their activities."[21] Wintour classe ruling parties, governments and armed forces commands as wizards of "new management".

"Management of news" is a term coined by James Reston, the America columnist, to describe the US government's system of manipulating the medi By the early seventies, the propaganda staff of the Federal executive authorit exceeded 10,000 public relations experts (the figure does not encompass th USIA or the Voice of America).

The Pentagon has over 3,000 such experts. Millions of dollars are allocate for justifying in the eyes of the Americans and the world at large the enormou military budgets of the United States and the arms race backed by the militar industrial complex. In collaboration with the CIA, the Pentagon's propagand machine invents myths about the "Soviet military threat" and the "aggressiv ness" of the Warsaw Treaty countries.

Arthur Sylvester, a former assistant US secretary of defence for publi relations, said in an attempt to justify the practices of his department that th government had an "inherent right . . . to lie".[22] His successor, Phil Gouldin admitted on resigning that for four years he had "misled and misinformed th American people a good many times".[23] "Lying," commented Marvin Calb, diplomatic correspondent of the CBS, "is a legitimate part of the defenc mechanism of the administration, and the reporter goes along with it when i his opinion it is in the national interest."[24] As if to sum up all the variou opinions, David Wise, an American commentator, said during a Congres hearing on "freedom of information": "The American people have not bee told the truth. . . . We now have a system of institutionalised lying."[25]

The CIA is the greatest abuser of the media. It virtually controls all "black and "grey" propaganda. "Black" propaganda, writer Victor Marchetti, . former CIA official, and John Marks, formerly of the State Department, i their much-discussed book, *The CIA and the Cult of Intelligence*, is identica with disinformation and the dissemination of frank lies. "Grey" propaganda they note, is "a mixture of truths, half-truths, and slight distortions . . . to slan the views of the audience".[26]

The CIA's best-known grey propaganda operations against the sociali countries are, according to Philip Agee, a former CIA official, the broadcast of Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty Munich.[27]

Public opinion in the capitalist countries has lately protested more and mor emphatically against the continued operation of the two stations, which forme US Senator William Fulbright called "relics of the cold war".

Progressive opinion demands that, as well as removing these "relics", a end be put to all the methods of psychological warfare and ideologic subversion used by "black" and "grey" propaganda experts in blatant viol tion of the Helsinki Final Act. There are quite a few experts of this sort on th CIA payroll. Several hundred American journalists and editors are secre agents of the CIA, wrote John Marks in *Columbia Journalism Review*.[28] Man

of these agents, David Rosenbaum of the *New York Times* reported, are "in executive positions for US news outlets".[29]

The US Senate Select Committee on Intelligence Activities (chairman, Senator Frank Church) published in the spring of 1976 a report disclosing that the CIA does not confine itself to using American journalists. The report speaks of several hundred foreign individuals scattered all over the world who supply the CIA with intelligence data and try to influence public opinion through secret propaganda.[30]

The information business, wrote Stuart Loory, professor of public affairs at Ohio State University, needs to and must co-operate with the CIA and other intelligence services. Ethical considerations . . . are secondary in these relations.[31]

Loory and other authors of articles on co-operation and interaction between the bourgeois mass media and the American CIA, British SIS and West German BND do not deny that this "need" rises primarily from the overall strategy used by imperialism against the socialist countries. Communist and Workers' parties, trade unions, international democratic organisations and all progressive forces.

This strategy was conceived as a direct answer to the rise of the world's first socialist state. It was intended to neutralise the revolutionary impact which the ideas of socialism, being embodied in the new society under construction in Soviet Russia, had on the peoples of all countries and to withhold the truth about the young worker-peasant republic, a truth gaining ground on all continents. These factors compelled the bourgeoisie of all countries greatly to step up their propaganda in close collaboration with the governments concerned. Since the end of World War II, the increased might and influence of the world socialist system, the weakening of imperialist positions and the deterioration of the general crisis of capitalism have forced bourgeois governments and mass media to co-ordinate their activities ever more carefully and carry on joint campaigns prompted by anti-communism and anti-Sovietism.

But the past sixty years have shown that no amount of propaganda campaigning can stop the victorious advance of Marxist-Leninist ideas, conceal the truth about existing socialism or reduce the impact of its inspiring example on the whole of mankind.

James Peterson

---

1 Lord Thomson of Fleet, *After I Was Sixty*, London, 1975, pp. 6, 175.
2 Ibid., p. 111.
3 Ibid., p. 38.
4 Ibid., p. 6.
5 Ibid., p. 192.
6 *The Guardian*, July 4, 1975.
7 *Fact*, July-August 1967.
8 B. Bagdikian, *The Information Machines*, New York, 1971, p. 133.
9 *Time*, July 27, 1962.
10 Thomas Griffith, *How True*, Boston, 1974, pp. 133-134.
11 *After I Was Sixty*, p. 132.
12 Theodore White, *The Making of the President—1964*, New York, 1965, pp. 86-87.
13 John Sandford, *The Mass Media of the German-Speaking Countries*, London, 1976, p. 37.
14 Antony Smith, *The Shadow in the Cave*, London, 1973, p. 64.

continued overleaf

[15] "The Media Under Pressure", an article by Andreas Bartsch and Reinhard Bispinck, FRG, gives revealing examples of the employers' arbitrary methods in broadcasting. Television had to renounce 13 serials on factory councils because the "employers' associations" saw them as threatening to undermine "trustful co-operation" between workers and employers. Under the notorious *Berufsverbot* law, Peter Kleinert was discharged from his TV job because he had told in a telecast about industrial accidents, including fatal ones, at an enterprise of Dynamit-Nobel-AG (*Blatter fur deutsche und internationale Politik*, December 1976, pp. 1378, 1382, 1383).

[16] *Columbia Journalism Review*, March/April 1972.

[17] Herbert I. Schiller, *The Mind Managers*, Boston, 1973, p. 19.

[18] Ibid. "The enormous and diverse system of American television," writes Antony Smith, the producer mentioned earlier, ". . . provides for the overwhelming mass of American viewers and listeners a stultifying sameness . . . the end-product betrays the signs of an appalling cultural tyranny."

[19] Ibid., pp. 20, 22.

[20] Herbert I. Schiller, *Communications and Cultural Domination*, White Plains, NY, 1976, p. 3.

[21] Charles Wintour, *Pressures on the Press*, London, 1972, p. 44.

[22] B. Ladd, *Crisis in Credibility*, New York, 1968, p. 3.

[23] *Newsweek*, March 23, 1970.

[24] *The Press in Washington*. Ed. Ray Elden Hilbert. New York, 1967, p. 162.

[25] *US Government Information Policies and Practices—the Pentagon Papers* (Part 2). Hearings Before a Subcommittee of the Committee on Government Operations. House of Representatives, Ninety-Second Congress, First Session (Washington, DC, 1971), pp. 329-330.

[26] Victor Marchetti and John D. Marks, *The CIA and the Cult of Intelligence*, New York, 1974, p. 165.

[27] Philip Agee, *Inside the Company: CIA Diary*, Harmondsworth, England, 1975, p. 72.

[28] *Columbia Journalism Review*, July/August 1976.

[29] *The New York Times*, April 27, 1976.

[30] *Columbia Journalism Review*, July/August 1976.

[31] Ibid., September/October 1974.

The Party Press

Growing Demand for Communist Publications

A RECENT plenary meeting of the CC, Communist Party of Venezuela, put on record substantial gains in circulating the Party's weekly *Tribuna Popular*, published in 10,000 copies in January 1976 and as many as 28,000 copies by the end of that year. The CC plans to raise circulation to 50,000 copies by November 1977, which would make *Tribuna Popular* a mass paper. This year the Party intends to circulate the weekly's 46 issues in a total of 1.5 million copies. Promotion campaigns will be conducted on May Day, on the 40th anniversary of the Party's First National Conference (August 8) and during celebrations of the 60th anniversary of the October Revolution (November). During these three campaigns, members of the Party and the Communist Youth expect to circulate 200,000 copies of *Tribuna Popular*.

There is also a notable increase in the demand for Marxist books and pamphlets. First among the titles sold are Lenin's writings, then come the

Party, including its Programme and Rules, and records of the Seventh Nationa Conference of the CPV. The Party maintains that the circulation of Marxis literature in several regions of the country can be increased in 1977 by 20 pe cent compared with last year.

L. Argent

Book Reviews

Lenin ob Oktyabre (Lenin on the October Revolution), Moscow, Politizdat 1977, 144 pp.

PART I of the collection includes excerpts from Lenin's works illustrating hi contribution to the Marxist theory of revolution and highlights his ideas on th historic mission of the working class—the hegemon of the working people— the growing over of bourgeois-democratic revolution into a socialist one, law of revolutions in the imperialist epoch, fusion of the proletarian movemen with the struggle of the peasants against landowners and with the national liberation movement. Part II contains documents of the period of the Octobe Revolution, written by Lenin, and extracts from his works describing the creative endeavour of the masses that won in the socialist revolution and the Party's tasks in the new conditions. Much prominence in the collection is given to the works by the great leader of the revolution in which he assessed the role of the October Revolution in the life of the peoples of Russia and in the history of mankind.

Marx, Engels, Lenin. Anarkisme og anarko-syndikalisme (Marx, Engels and Lenin on Anarchism and Anarcho-Syndicalism). Oslo, Forlaget Ny Dag, 1976, 336 pp.

THIS new collection of articles, letters and speeches by the classics of scientific communism reveals the origins and essence of the anarchic tendencies in the working class movement and outlines the tasks of a working class party in combating these tendencies. The book describes the enormous work done by Marx, Engels and Lenin in overcoming anarchism and anarcho-syndicalism in the international working-class movement.

M. Vicent, *Femmes: quelle liberation?* (Women's Liberation: What Kind?). Paris, Editions sociales, 1976, 166 pp.

THE author, a Political Bureau member of the French Communist Party, describes women's conditions in today's France and the difficulties they are facing now in crisis-stricken capitalist society. She sets forth the concrete suggestions of the FCP to improve women's working conditions and change their role in the family and in society. Socialism alone, she concludes, offers real opportunities for the complete social and economic emancipation of women.

A. Wernecke, *Biologismus und ideologischer Klassenkampf* (Biologism and the Ideological and Class Struggle). Berlin, Dietz Verlag, 1976, 301 pp.

IN explaining the crisis phenomena affecting economic, political and cultural life of capitalist society, bourgeois ideologists and propagandists often refer to the "biological factor", alleging that human nature is inherently vicious. The Marxist philosopher from the GDR provides a detailed criticism of the man-hating, anti-human theories of social and neosocial Darwinism, "genetic determination", and racism, revealing the class interest behind these theories, which, he proves, are scientifically untenable.

W. Gerns, R. Steigerwald, *Für eine sozialistische Bundesrepublik, Fragen und Antworten zur Strategie und Taktik der DKP* (For a Socialist Federal Republic. Questions and Answers on the Strategy and Tactics of the GDP). Frankfurt am Main, Verlag Marxistische Blätter, 1976, 96 pp.
TWO leading members of the German Communist Party set forth the goals of the Party and the proposals it advances to overcome the economic difficulties and social inequality in the Federal Republic. They present the Communist vision of the FRG's future and list the principles underlying the GCP's relations with other Communist parties of the world and with the international Communist and working-class movement. The authors explain the significance for West Germans of the struggle for peace and international security carried on by the world progressive forces, above all the socialist countries.

E. Caicedo, *Conflictos sociales del siglo XX en Colombia* (Twentieth Century Social Conflicts in Colombia). Bogota, 1976, 72 pp.
E. CAICEDO, a well-known writer, journalist and historian, Editor-in-Chief of *Vos Proletaria*, daily paper of the Communist Party of Colombia, analyses the evolution of the struggle waged by the working class and peasants for the country's national independence and social progress. He pays special attention to such events as the 1928 strike of banana growers which marked an important stage in the shaping of the Colombian proletariat, the 1948 popular mass protest against the assassination of Jorge Eliecer Gaitan, a progressive political leader, and the emergence of the guerrilla movement. The awareness of the revolutionary goals of the Colombian Communists, he concludes, is growing in various sections of the population.

Levoye studencheskoye dvizheniye v stranakh kapitala (The Left Student Movement in Capitalist Countries). Moscow, Nauka Publishers, 1976, 311 pp.
IN this monograph a group of Soviet scholars give a detailed review of the history of the student movement in the capitalist world, analysing the struggle of various political parties for influence in the movement. They focus on the policy of Communists designed to overcome "leftist" sentiments at universities, colleges and schools, and on involvement of students in the struggle of the working class and all working people.

E. Peggio, *La crisi economica italiana* (Economic Crisis in Italy). Milan, Rizzoli, 1976, 117 pp.
AN economist and prominent member of the Italian Communist Party, the author looks into the origins of the economic crisis in Italy and its consequences for millions of working people. He explains the Communists' proposals on overcoming the difficult situation in industry and agriculture.

English edition of
PROBLEMS OF PEACE AND SOCIALISM

Theoretical and information journal of Communist and Workers' Parties throughout the world

PUBLISHED IN PRAGUE WORKERS OF ALL LANDS UNITE

VOLUME 20 JUNE 1977 NO. 6

CONTENTS

PROBLEMS OF PEACE AND SOCIALISM

is also published in Arabic, Bengali, Bulgarian, Czech, Danish, Finnish, French, German, Greek, Hebrew, Hindi, Hungarian, Italian, Japanese, Malayalam, Mongolian, Norwegian, Persian, Polish, Portuguese, Punjabi, Romanian, Russian, Singhalese, Spanish, Swedish, Tamilnad, Turkish and Vietnamese.

Enquiries for subscriptions to any of these editions should be sent to Press Circulation Agency, Thakurova 3, 16616 Prague 6, Czechoslovakia.

Published by S. C. Easton, 16 King Street, London, W.C.2., and printed by Farleigh Press (T.U.) Ltd., Watford

Communique

on Conference of Communist and Workers' Parties on the Work of *Problems of Peace and Socialism*

FROM April 27 to 29, 1977, representatives of 75 Communist and Workers' parties held a Conference in Prague to discuss the work of the journal *Problems of Peace and Socialism* (World Marxist Review). The following parties took part in the Conference: Socialist Vanguard Party of Algeria, Argentinian Communists, Communist Party of Austria, Communist Party of Belgium, Communist Party of Bolivia, Brazilian Communist Party, Bulgarian Communist Party, Communist Party of Canada, Communist Party of Chile, Communist Party of Columbia, People's Vanguard Party of Costa Rica, Communist Party of Cuba, Progressive Party of the Working People of Cyprus AKEL, Communist Party of Czechoslovakia, Communist Party of Denmark, Dominican Communist Party, Communist Party of Ecuador, Communist Party of Finland, French Communist Party, People's Progressive Party of Gayana, Socialist Unity Party of Germany, German Communist Party, Communist Party of Great Britain, Communist Party of Greece, Guadeloupe Communist Party, Guatemalan Party of Labour, Communist Party of Honduras, Hungarian Socialist Workers' Party, Communist Party of India, Communist Party of Indonesia, People's Party of Iran (Tudeh), Iraqi Communist Party, Communist Party of Ireland, Communist Party of Israel, Italian Communist Party, Communist Party of Japan, Jordanian Communist Party, People's Revolutionary Party of Laos, Lebanese Communist Party, Communist Party of Lesotho, Communist Party of Luxembourg, Communist Party of Malta, Martinique Communist Party, Mexican Communist Party, Mongolian People's Revolutionary Party, Party of Progress and Socialism of Morocco, Socialist Unity Party of New Zealand, Nicaraguan Socialist Party, Communist Party of Norway, Paraguayan Communist Party, Peruvian Communist Party, Communist Party of the Philippines, Polish United Workers' Party, Portuguese Communist Party, Puerto Rican Communist Party, Reunion Communist Party, Rumanian Communist Party, Communist Party of Salvador, San Marino Communist Party, African Party of Independence of Senegal, South African Communist Party, Communist Party of the Soviet Union, Communist Party of Spain, Communist Party of Sri Lanka, Sudanese Communist Party, Left Party—Communists of Sweden, Swiss Party of Labour, Syrian Communist Party, Tunisian Communist Party, Communist Party of Turkey, Communist Party of the United States of America, Communist Party of Uruguay, Communist Party of Venezuela, Socialist Unity Party of West Berlin, and one more party whose name is not mentioned at its request.

The Conference discussed the Report of the Editorial Board and Editorial Council describing in detail the work done by the editors in carrying out the tasks set before the journal by the previous Conference, in elucidating the successes of world socialism, the working-class and national-liberation movements, and the experience gained by the fraternal parties in various countries of the world.

The delegations represented at the Conference took an active part in the debates which proceeded in a frank, constructive and fraternal atmosphere. They

formulated their assessments and recommendations with the aim of helping to improve the activity of the journal.

The representatives of Communist and Workers' parties recommended the Editorial Board and Editorial Council to base their activity on the assessments and recommendations made at the Conference. They expressed a wish that the editorial staff of the international journal *Problems of Peace and Socialism* work still better and better, in a spirit of equality, co-operation and respect for the sovereignty of each party and its policy. The journal will thus contribute to the study of problems and to the dissemination of the ideas of peace, democracy, national liberation and socialism, to the struggle against imperialism, to the consolidation of the internationalist solidarity of Communists and all progressive forces.

Presentation of World Peace Council Award

AT a session of the Conference of Representatives of Communist and Workers' Parties, held to discuss the work of *Problems of Peace and Socialism* (World Marxist Review), the journal was presented with the World Peace Council's Scroll of Honour, an award unanimously approved by the WPC Presidential Committee last February. Presenting the Scroll of Honour, Romesh Chandra, Secretary General of the World Peace Council, said:

"This is the first award ever made by the World Peace Council to any journal anywhere. It is made because of the outstanding contribution to the cause of peace, to the promotion of detente, to the struggle for disarmament and national independence, against imperialism, colonialism, neocolonialism, racism and exploitation, for social progress, for a new and better life for all peoples. This is an award not only to the Editorial Board and Editorial Council and the journal's international staff, but to all those who help to produce it in all its languages and to distribute it in different countries and continents.

"The World Peace Council has grown broader and broader. In its highest organs there are leaders of Communist parties, revolutionary-democratic, Socialist and Social-Democratic, Christian-Democratic, Liberal and Radical parties, national parliaments, national-liberation movements and fronts.

"The growth of the movement is due to the carrying forward of the methods of work, the outlook and the zeal and determination, the optimism and confidence laid down by the founders of the peace movement.

"We think today and always particularly of our founder President Frederick Joliot-Curie. It was he who gave us that belief in the power of the world peace movement, its internationalism, which animates us today.

"We present the Scroll of Honour with the hope that the co-operation between the journal and the World Peace Council will grow with every year, and particularly during this year of the 60th anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution."

In his reply Konstantin Zarodov, the *WMR* Editor-in-Chief, thanked the

World Peace Council warmly for its high award and assured it that, in future too, the journal will carry on an active struggle for peace and international security, for social progress and socialism.

International Politics and Moral Standards

RENÉ URBANY
Chairman, Communist Party of Luxembourg

THE present age is one of substantial positive changes in the system of international relations. They are a direct result of the revolutionising effect that the socialist countries, the international working class, the national liberation movement and the other democratic movements have had on world politics. These forces deserve the main credit for the fact that the principles of peaceful coexistence, despite the resistance of imperialist reaction, have become the key trend in international relations.

In a resolution passed by the 22nd Congress of our Party we stressed that "a further shift in the balance of forces, a shift in favour of peace, democracy and socialism, has occurred in world politics, in the international class struggle". We noted that this was primarily due to the outstanding successes achieved in the economic and social development of the Soviet Union and the whole socialist community, to socialism's active foreign policy. We also pointed out the important role played by the working class, by progressive public opinion in the capitalist countries and the forces of national liberation in normalising international life.

In analysing the changes on the international scene we have as usual begun by investigating their class basis. This has led us to the general conclusion that the turn towards detente reflects a definite shift in the development of class contradictions, particularly those that operate on an international scale. At the same time the class approach to such a complex process as the incipient peaceful restructuring of international relations does not imply straightforward conclusions, such as the allegation that in this global contest detente offers greater advantages to one side than to the other. On the contrary, in the thermonuclear age the preservation and strengthening of peace, the creation of international political conditions removing the danger of armed conflict is in the interests of all mankind, the very existence and development of civilisation. The international efforts to relax world political tensions are therefore extremely humane. Detente is profoundly moral. It has a fundamentally ethical purpose.

The question of morality in foreign policy is a complex one. No one can claim to deal with it fully in a magazine article, so I shall confine myself to only some of the main aspects that have a special urgency today.

It is by no means a matter of indifference to Communists what ethical principles are involved in a given act of foreign policy and how far the means used in international politics accord with these principles.

The founders of Marxism emphasised that it was definite ethical principles and moral values that could and should be the working class's most powerful means of influencing international affairs while the working people had no access to the levers of state power and were still unable to exert direct control over their countries' foreign policy. As only one instance I quote Karl Marx's famous appeal to the workers "to vindicate the simple laws of morals and justice, which ought to govern the relations of private individuals, as the rules paramount of the intercourse of nations".

The influence of the working masses on world politics, including their moral influence, has grown enormously since the proletariat emerged on the international scene as a state-organised class. In view of the approaching 60th anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution it may properly be stated that in the development of international relations this greatest event of the century opened up a new stage not only by fundamentally changing the distribution of class forces in world politics, but also by introducing to this sphere highly ethical, humanistic, moral principles that it had in practice never known before.

The first steps taken by Soviet power in foreign policy, including above all the world-famous Decree on Peace written by Lenin, were acts reflecting a breakthrough in the development of the world class struggle, a real victory for the proletariat in its historic battle for liberation, for the social and national emancipation of all the oppressed and exploited. But these were also acts of genuine morality, acts expressing a highly moral attitude to man and based on the moral principles of the working class, the people of toil.

The contribution of real socialism to the history of international relations may, in our view, be summed up as unprecedented political energy in the effort to prevent the second world war, heroism and self-sacrifice to rid the world of fascist barbarity, the creation and consolidation of the socialist community based on the principles of equality, mutual support, all-round solidarity and co-operation, the use of its influence and resources to free the peoples from the chains of colonial dependence, and a most enterprising and consistent campaign for global security. This contribution has tremendous political and also moral significance.

I shall probably not be mistaken if I say that Europeans, the people who live on our continent, which was the main theatre of two world wars and which experienced many of the nightmares of the cold war, are particularly aware of the benefits deriving from the active peace policy of the Soviet Union and the other countries of the socialist community. Everyone admits that Europe's political climate has become a lot healthier in the seventies. Some people realised this only after Helsinki. Others noted the change for the better even earlier, after the signing of treaties normalising the situation in Central Europe. We Communists, and along with us everyone who has not been blinded to the truth by capitalist propaganda, attribute the beginning of this positive development to the initiatives embodied in the Peace Programme of the 24th Congress of the CPSU, to the international political actions that quickly became known among the general public as socialism's peace offensive.

The outstanding part played by the Soviet Union and the socialist community as a whole in achieving this swing from cold war to detente has boosted their prestige in the eyes of the great mass of the people, of public opinion across the

world. This is quite natural. But it is also natural that the enhanced prestige of socialist foreign policy should be noted unfavourably by the ruling class in the capitalist countries. As everybody living in any West European country is aware, the capitalist-controlled mass media have lately doubled and redoubled their attacks on the socialist countries, on the Soviet Union and their international activities. This sometimes looks like an absurd paradox. While the diplomats stubbornly push ahead on the difficult road of detente, the big monopoly-owned press does its best to plunge public opinion back into the world of cold war fantasies.

The propaganda cliches that the newspapers, radio and television pound into the heads of West Europeans are still the same old myths about the "Soviet threat". We hear and read daily that Moscow is using the policy of detente merely as a screen for its "expansionist aims", that the member states of the Warsaw Treaty are only concerned with building up a military superiority over the NATO countries.

The smear campaign against the foreign policy of the Soviet Union and the whole socialist community is obviously angled to make people believe that socialism's unprecedented influence on international life is only due to its military might, to the fact that it is backed by armed force, and so on. No one will deny that the socialist countries' defence capacity carries a great deal of weight in world politics. But it is simply unrealistic to assert that socialism's international positions are determined solely by considerations of military power and its consolidation. An essential component of the socialist peace policy to which the peoples of Europe and other parts of the world already owe a growing sense of security is the consistent struggle for disarmament, which Lenin described as the ideal of socialism (see *Coll. Works*, Vol. 23, p. 95).

All the main practical steps towards backing up political detente with military detente are the result of agreements initiated by the Soviet Union. For example, there was the Moscow test-ban treaty, the treaty on non-proliferation of nuclear weapons and the agreement on banning bacteriological weapons. In the past three decades the USSR has put forward more than seventy proposals for halting the arms race, curbing military spending, reducing the burden they impose, and erecting treaty barriers to the use of force in international relations. The achievement of practical steps towards general disarmament is one of the programmatic foreign policy guidelines formulated by the 25th Congress of the CPSU.

It will be understood that no state counting entirely on force of arms in its international policy-making would show such perseverance and consistency in working for disarmament or keep looking for new opportunities of relieving its people and all humankind of ruinous spending on armaments and the dangerous stockpiling of deadly devices.

While remaining a realist and consequently acknowledging the full significance of socialism's armed might as a necessary factor in present-day foreign policy, one cannot fail to see that the international prestige and influence of this policy are not to be measured in terms of rockets and tanks. Its power of attraction lies in its peacefulness, in its dedication to the things that are of real value to the security, independence and equality of the peoples, its dedication to the ethical principles underlying the policy of peace pursued by the socialist countries.

We are living in an age when the thoughts, dreams, hopes, vital interests and expectations and also the moral standards of millions, perhaps even billions of ordinary people, are acquiring far more weight in international affairs than in times gone by, when the balance of world forces was different. The days have now passed when only the banks, the big arms manufacturers and the political oligarchies and groups subservient to them ruled the fate of the world. When we Communists speak of the major, world-scale victories of the forces of peace, democracy and socialism, we think above all of the greatly enhanced role of the peoples, of public opinion, in shaping foreign policy, their immeasurably increased influence on international life.

What politician can allow himself to close his eyes to this historically new situation? Only one who has lost all sense of world realities and is completely out of touch with his times. But in politics, heeding the voice of public opinion and the mood of the masses is still not the same as expressing them in one's own position, in practical actions. Demagogy is also a way of "heeding" the people's demands. The political history of capitalism, from long ago to the present day, abounds in cases when the ruling class, the capitalists, adapted themselves to the social psychology of the masses, to their obvious democratic aspirations and wishes. At times this adaptation of imperialism to current conditions has taken the form of real concessions to the people; more often it has been purely verbal.

In recent months the foreign-policy statements of the new administration in the United States have attracted world attention. The new administration has declared its aim to be the "moral regeneration" of Washington's diplomacy. It has proclaimed its belief in "people's diplomacy" or "politics without diplomacy". All this has been presented with an eye to the dramatic effect, with the obvious intention of rallying wide support and approval both at home and abroad.

No one need have any doubts as to why America's new president and his aides are taking such pains to renovate their country's foreign-policy slogans and make them suitably attractive. The shock-wave that started this spurt of activity was the deepening of the crisis of world capitalism, its economy, its system of social relations, its internal and international policies. The crisis has been exceptionally damaging to US imperialism and its positions across the world. For its leading role in the cold war, for its open claims to world supremacy, for the criminal adventure in Vietnam, for its constant infringements of the sovereignty of independent countries and actions amounting to the export of counter-revolution, as in Chile, for example, and for the fact that in postwar years Washington, according to the Americans' own calculations, has on no fewer than 215 occasions seriously threatened to unleash some of its military might in order to gain diplomatic leverage[1]—for all this the United States has had to pay by loss of its moral reputation on the international scene. Even among its closest allies it has begun to arouse suspicion and distrust. The brief but accurate enough assessment that it most frequently and quite justifiably made of state of US foreign policy in the seventies is to call it a "crisis of credibility".

United States ruling circles are seriously worried about the situation. In an issue of the influential American journal *Foreign Affairs* that appeared a year before the change of incumbent in the White House, one could read that "the moral political and economic power of the United States have deteriorated", that since Vietnam and Watergate the country has been faced with the task of

"political and psychological regeneration", and that this has stimulated Washington's foreign policy-makers to look for a "broad humanitarian theme" that would "make the conduct of American foreign policy easier", although in present-day circumstances "it is far from apparent what ideological bugle would call, would arouse a consensus among the US public and spark a moral crusade".[2]

Now that President Carter has announced his intention of making morality the guiding principle of US foreign policy and there has been time for his doctrine to undergo its first practical tests, one is entitled to ask whether this "ideological bugle" has been found, whether a way of extracting the United States from its "crisis of credibility" has been devised.

Strictly speaking, what Washington's official statements about wanting to put its foreign policy on a moral basis amount to is a promise to close the yawning gap between word and deed that has featured in almost every international action of the United States in recent decades. The classical example is the all-out support that the US, while proclaiming its dedication to freedom, gives to dictatorships, to police, fascist and racist regimes. Surely, the significance of a political position should be judged by deeds rather than words and, if the two do not tally, the position is probably not worth much from the moral point of view.

Judged on these lines, what impression has been made by Washington's moves in the international field under the new administration?

When one person makes a proposal he knows to be unacceptable and, having got a dusty answer, accuses his negotiating partner of intractability, obstinacy and other mortal sins, such conduct is usually described as two-faced or, at any rate, far removed from generally accepted moral standards. Surely, then, there can be no objection to a similar assessment of international conduct—for example, that of the United States, particularly as this is what that country advocates in proposing morality as the guiding light of its foreign policy. What are we to say about Washington's stance, for example, in the Soviet-American dialogue on limitation of strategic weapons? These lines are being written only a few days after the March visit of the US Secretary of State to Moscow. American officials and the press are doing their best to present the USSR as an opponent of arms reduction. But what does it all amount to? First, we have an unreasonable demand for unilateral advantages, which is then followed by thunderous accusations that the Soviet Union does not want a mutually acceptable agreement. Is this in accord with moral standards?

The new government of the United States has not hesitated to proclaim officially that with a policy allegedly oriented on moral criteria it intends to work for the changes it wants in the laws, statutes and way of life of other countries. In ordinary life, arbitrary assumption of the right to teach others has always been considered immoral. In international relations such pretensions, which inevitably involve encroachment on the sovereign rights of nations and blatant violation of the principle of non-interference in the affairs of other countries, are even further removed from morality.

The whole series of recent statements and moves by Washington, taking the form of crude attacks on the social and political system of socialism and, of course, dictated by an alleged concern for the "moral regeneration" of United States' foreign policy, has been highly reminiscent of the worst examples of cold war diplomacy. Can the name of morality be given to anything that threatens to

poison the atmosphere of detente and reverse the process of normalisin international life on which humanity pins its best hopes and to which so muc energy and patience has been devoted? Does behaviour that can only undermin the security of the peoples conform to the concept of "people's diplomacy"?

As we see, avowing one's dedication to ethical ideals is not in itself a guarante of moral integrity. What is more, such avowals are particularly immoral an *particularly dangerous when they are used to conceal political practices that ru* counter to the most democratic and humane demands of our time.

It is no accident that the US conception of "moral politics", far from inspirin global enthusiasm, has, on the contrary, had a cool reception among broa sections of the public and has caused some concern even among Washington allies. Many bourgeois statesmen in West European countries have considere the matter soberly and felt obliged to warn that, in view of the realities (international life, this American "playing at morality" could turn out to b "playing with fire". Whether the new US administration realises this will be see in the very near future.

As regards the progressive forces and particularly ourselves, the Communist we see it as our duty to remain extremely vigilant towards ideological an political manoeuvres of imperialism, not only American but any kind, includin West European. We expose the actual motivating forces behind these policie and try to prove to the mass of the people that we are right in our analysis an conclusions. In this we are helped by the fact that we define imperialist policie from the class and moral standpoint.

Earlier we quoted what Marx said about the great role of the concepts c morality and justice in the attitude of the working class to international politic: But his thinking did not stop there. He did not leave us to assume that a mor foreign policy is an aim in itself. Marx went on to stress that "the fight for such foreign policy forms part of the general struggle for emancipation of the workin classes". This remains our, Communist, position today. We understand lastin peace on earth as the supreme value for all mankind and also as the best possibl setting for further gains in the fight for social progress.

---

[1] See *Time*, January 17, 1977, p. 25.
[2] See *Foreign Affairs*, January 1976, pp. 271, 272, 275, 277.

We Saw the Brotherhood of Nations

SARADA MITRA
National Council member, Communist Party of India
ADEL HABA
CC member, Iraqi Communist Party

WHEN preparing to visit the Soviet Union at the invitation of the CC CPSU to see how relations between nations were developing in the 60th year of Soviet power, we recalled Lenin's ideas which have constituted a coherent theory for solving this intricate problem; we acquainted ourselves with the basic documents of Soviet state and the Party congresses; and read once again the speech by General Secretary of the CC CPSU Leonid Brezhnev, "On the Fiftieth Anniversary of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics", and the CC CPSU Report to the 24th and the 25th congresses of the Leninist Party.

Both of us had visited the Soviet Union before, and on several occasions. We were aware that all the main aspects of the nationalities question have been solved in the world's first socialist country. We now had the opportunity of having a really close look "from inside", and of understanding what the solution of the nationalities question actually means for one Soviet republic—Azerbaijan, for the Azerbaijanians themselves and for the other nations and nationalities living on its territory. We now had the opportunity of seeing and comprehending through the prism of the Marxist-Leninist doctrine on the nationalities question, the problems facing our countries and our Communist parties in this sphere, and with an awareness of the importance of exposing the slanders being heaped on the Soviet Union by the imperialists and others of that ilk, among whom national relations are a favourite topic.[1]

In this case, we were mostly concerned with Leninist principles and the CPSU's policy which translated them into life. After all, the nationalities question is also exceptionally acute in our countries—India and Iraq—and is a key problem for any of the countries which we have come to designate as the young national states, most of which are multinational. Nor has the problem become less acute in the developed capitalist countries: one need merely recall the clashes in the United States, Canada, Belgium, Great Britain and Spain on the national issue.

This explains why our notes are strictly selective. For us the most important thing is that we have seen the new, socialist nations and nationalities, and the new relations between them, and have gained an even clearer awareness of the international importance of the Soviet experience in solving the nationalities problem.

Consistent Political Equality

The Azerbaijan Soviet Socialist Republic has an involved history behind it. At the time of the October Revolution, the Baku Bolshevik organisation was one of the strongest and most militant, and the Baku Council of People's Commissars

was formed almost simultaneously with the formation of the first Soviet government in Petrograd under Lenin's chairmanship. But this was followed by the British intervention and the brutal murder of the 26 Baku commissars. Power was taken over by the Musavatists, a group of bourgeois nationalists. Soviet power was re-established only after the expulsion of the interventionists, on April 28, 1920. Soon Azerbaijan, together with Georgia and Armenia, became part of the Transcaucasian Soviet Federal Socialist Republic. Since 1936, Azerbaijan has been an independent Soviet Republic within the Soviet Union.

How is the equality of nations and citizens of various nationalities in the Soviet Union guaranteed in legal terms? That was our first question to **K. A. Khalilov**, President of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the Azerbaijan Republic.

K. Khalilov. The Constitution of the USSR has so defined the country's federal structure as to ensure the equality of each nation at every level of the national-state structure.[2]

To begin with, the USSR Supreme Soviet, the highest state organ of power, consists of two equal chambers, the Soviet of the Union and the Soviet of Nationalities. While the Soviet of the Union is elected on the basis of proportional representation—one deputy for every 300,000 of the population—in the Soviet of Nationalities each Union Republic, regardless of the size of its territory and population, has 32 deputies; each Autonomous Republic, 11 deputies, each Autonomous Region, 5 deputies; and each National Area, 1 deputy. Thus, in the Soviet of Nationalities, our Republic has 32 deputies, plus 11 deputies from the Nakhichevan Autonomous Republic, plus 5 deputies from the Nagorny Karabakh Autonomous Region, a total of 48 deputies, with a population of 5.7 million (and 15 deputies in the Soviet of the Union).[3]

All the Presidents of the Presidia of the Supreme Soviets of the Union Republics are Vice-Presidents of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet, all Ministers of the Union Republics are members of the USSR Council of Ministers, and the Chairmen of the Supreme Courts of the Union Republics are members of the USSR Supreme Court, and so on. This means, K. Khalilov emphasised, that all the Union Republics participate directly and on a par in the formation and election of the highest organs of our federal state.

I should also like to draw your attention to the important fact that the Constitution of the USSR does not merely proclaim the equality of nations, but also provides for responsibility before the law for any direct or indirect restriction of rights, or, conversely, for the establishment of privileges for citizens depending on their racial or national origin, and for the preaching of racial or national exclusiveness or hatred.

Such is the constitutional solution of the problem. But what has mainly ensured genuine equality for all the Republics and peoples of the USSR is, of course, the Soviet socialist system: the abolition of private and establishment of social property in the means of production, the elimination of social oppression, the takeover of power by the people with the working class at its head, and the working people's involvement in administration at every level, that is, the construction of a socialist society, the only true basis for solving the nationalities problem.

A. Haba. We are aware that the Republics are now very closely integrated with each other, especially in the economic sphere. They have become, as Leonid

Brezhnev said, an integrated economic organism. That being so, could you explain what the sovereignty of the Union Republics means in this context?

K. Khalilov. First of all, each Union Republic has its own Constitution. These Constitutions are inspired by the Constitution of the USSR, a mother with 15 daughters, who are alike but have their own specific features. Furthermore, we ourselves lay down our administrative-territorial structure, and this is written into the Constitution of the Azerbaijan Republic. No changes can be made in our territory without our consent. The Republic has broad rights in the economic field: for instance, we have the right to allocate the republican plan among the enterprises, as we see fit; we take part, through the system of Union Republican ministries, in administering virtually every sector of the national economy and sphere of social life on the territory of our Republic.

Our Republic "shall have the right to enter into direct relations with foreign states, to conclude agreements and to exchange diplomatic and consular representatives with them" (Article 16a, Constitution of the AzSSR), and also "shall have its own Republican military formations" (Article 16b, Constitution of the AzSSR).

Finally, all the domestic matters in the Republic are within the competence of its own organs (Article 19, Constitution of the AzSSR).

The right of the Union Republics to secede is written into the Constitution of the USSR, and also into the Constitution of Azerbaijan SSR, whose Article 15 says: "The Azerbaijan Soviet Socialist Republic shall retain the right of free withdrawal from the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics".

What would happen, we asked, if any of the Republics should wish to use this right?

We have to admit that everyone present looked at us in some bewilderment. But we did get a serious and clearcut answer. The Soviet Republics, K. Khalilov said, are not only linked by defence, economic and other material interests but also have bonds of *spiritual kinship and affinity*. A new historical entity, the Soviet People, has taken shape. This is not some supranational formation, nor an amorphous alloy in which the various ethnic groups have been dissolved without trace. This entity is based on the unbreakable alliance of the working class, the peasantry and the intelligentsia, with the leading role of the working class, and the friendship of all the Soviet peoples. We find the very idea of seceding from the Soviet Union a very odd one indeed. Still, retention of this clause in the Constitution is meaningful because, while confirming one of the inalienable rights of any people, of any nation, to self-determination, it contributes to still closer unity of the Soviet republics.

When recalling this conversation, we pondered the following question: the Soviet Republics have immensely more independence than, say, the states constituting the Indian Union. Yet the degree of unity and cohesion among the Soviet Republics is very much higher than it is in India.

Of course, as Khalilov correctly emphasised, it is the socialist social system, the abolition of man's exploitation by man that makes all the difference. That is the basis for the genuine equality and friendship of nations and their coming closer together. But Lenin also attached much importance to the question of legal equality, which he saw as the only possibility for what might be called the peaceful coexistence of nations in a democratically constituted bourgeois society. The relevant passage from the Revolution on the Nationalities Question,

written by Lenin, and adopted by the Poronin Conference of the CC RSDLP 1913, says:

"Insofar as national peace is in any way possible in a capitalist society based exploitation, profit-making and strife, it is attainable only under a consistent and thoroughly democratic republican system of government which guarante full equality of all the nations and languages, which recognises no *compulso* official language (italics are ours—*Authors*), provides the people with schoo where instruction is given in all the native languages, and the constitution which contains a fundamental law that prohibits any privileges whatsoever any one nation and any encroachment whatsoever upon the rights of a nation minority. This particularly calls for wide regional autonomy and fu democratic local self-government, with the boundaries of the self-governing a autonomous regions determined by the local inhabitants themselves on the ba of their economic and social conditions, national make-up of the populatio etc." (*Coll. Works,* Vol. 19, pp. 427-428.)

It seems that that is a minimum programme which should be advocated by t Communists in the newly-free countries which have yet to take the socialist pat That is what the experience of, say, India indicates.

The point is that for a long time India was under colonial oppression, and th produced in that country—which like the Soviet Union is inhabited by hundre of nationalities and small peoples—an urge for national unity, for a nation identity. However, the national distinctions, mainly in the form of languag persisted. That is why the delay in setting up states on the linguistic principl upon independence largely helped to develop linguistic and regional chauvinisn

The Communist Party of India has always supported the establishment of ne states on the linguistic principle and of autonomous districts for nation minorities (tribes). The Party is sure that political equality is a necessary step solving the nationalities problem.

Upon arriving in Azerbaijan, we did not simply find ourselves in one of the Union Republics. We realised that we were in a multinational state, for t number of nationalities and small peoples living in Azerbaijan is not very mu smaller than it is in the whole of the Soviet Union. Members of the Communi Party of Azerbaijan (the Azerbaijan organisation of the CPSU) belong to nationalities, as we were told by **R. G. Mamed-zade**, Secretary of the CC of t Communist Party of Azerbaijan. We were naturally interested to know how t nationalities question has been settled in Azerbaijan itself.

The latest—1970—census showed that the largest national groups in t population of the Republic were Azerbaijanians (73.8 per cent), Russians (10 p cent) and Armenians (9.0 per cent).

We find, therefore, that Azerbaijanians are the majority determining t national face of the Republic. Within the Republic's system of government this reflected above all in the composition of its Supreme Soviet, where the number deputies is roughly proportional to the share of each nationality within t population.[4]

Upon hearing this, we at once wanted to know whether there were any quot for each nationality. We asked this question again and again, and the answer w always the same.

R. G. Mamed-zade. There are no quotas at all, and everything depends personal qualities and merits. It is not at all exceptional for an Armenian or

Russian to be elected as a deputy to the representative organs of the Republic or of the whole Union from an area where the majority are Azerbaijanians, and vice versa. But the Party sees to it that all nationalities are represented on the elective organs *in accordance with their share of the population*, to prevent anyone from having a sense of wounded pride because of the impression that his nationality is being discriminated against.

That was the start of a serious conversation about the Party's role in solving the nationalities problem and, most importantly, in consolidating and deepening the friendship that has taken shape among the various nations. But that is a question with which we intend to deal specially later.

Another question is that of the rights enjoyed within the framework of the AzSSR by the relatively large and well-knit national groups.

In Azerbaijan, as in other Union Republics, this problem is also solved through national autonomy, as Lenin had suggested. We found that there were *two such compact groups. The first, also an Azerbaijanian one, lives in an area* separated from the main territory of the Republic but closely linked with it economically, historically and culturally. To cater for the needs of this group, the Nakhichevan Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic was set up within the Azerbaijan SSR. The other are the Armenians, who live on the territory of Azerbaijan in the Nagorny Karabakh Region, an autonomous region which we visited.

The first question we asked there was: Why is the region not a part of the Armenian SSR, from which it is separated only by a narrow strip of land?

We got our answer from **B. S. Kevorkov**, First Secretary of the Nagorny Karabakh Regional Committee of the Party, and a member of the Communist Party of Azerbaijan's CC Bureau. He said: The history of Nagorny Karabakh is closely interwoven with Azerbaijan's. The region has economic bonds with Azerbaijan, and is especially closely linked with Nizmenny Karabakh, a neighbouring district inhabited by Azerbaijanians. By contrast, the region is close to Armenia geographically but is separated by it by high mountains, which were an insuperable barrier in the past for any extensive contacts. However, in Nagorny Karabakh we have preserved the national Armenian traditions and language.

The existence of a compactly settled national group, together with considerations of economic advisability going to create the best conditions for socio-economic development, provided the basis for the establishment of the Nagorny Karabakh Autonomous Region in 1923.

A. Haba. Was this understood as a justifiable solution and immediately accepted by everyone?

B. Kevorkov. Of course, it took much educational effort. Some said: "I may not live a rich life, but I will be linked with Armenia." But this was not an expression of bourgeois nationalistic considerations, the basis for which had been eliminated together with the exploitative system, but merely an expression of backwardness and ignorance. The point was well driven home by life itself, by rapid economic and cultural development of the region and rising living standards, with complete equality, respect for national traditions and customs, and concern and attention on the part of the Communist Party of Azerbaijan's Central Committee.

"As a part of Azerbaijan, the Armenian people of Nagorny Karabakh have

gained their own statehood, and have made their choice of their own fr
we were later told by **V. M. Gabrielyan**, *First Secretary of the Martuni*
Party Committee.

Nagorny Karabakh has great rights. With a population of only 160,(region has 7 deputies in the Supreme Soviet of the USSR (1 in the Sovie Union, 1 in the Soviet of Nationalities from Azerbaijan, and 5 fr Autonomous Region) plus 12 deputies in the Supreme Soviet of the Aze SSR. The broad powers of the Region's Soviet of Working People's D and its Executive Committee are written into the Constitution of the Az

When travelling across the Republic and talking with men and wo different nationalities, we saw for ourselves that complete democracy equality and special concern for the interests of small nationalities, which precepts of Lenin's, have become everyday practices with Soviet people Communist Party of the Soviet Union, and are a great force which h cement the various nations constituting the Soviet people.

Breaches of these principles and refusal of autonomy to national mi inevitably produce conflicts among the nationalities, for which the youn have to pay a high price. Thus, Iraq, where one of us comes from, has h experience with the problem of Iraqi Kurdistan, whose population—the largest nation in the country—was stubbornly refused autonomy (which c Communists invariably advocated) by the successive reactionary gover and this led to a protracted national-liberation struggle which fre developed into war. Only the Law on Autonomy, whose adoption was b about by the progressive National Patriotic Front, with the participatio Iraqi Communist Party, and which was endorsed in 1974 by the gove headed by the Baath Party, helped to put an end to the bloodshed and ope fresh vistas for the working people of Iraqi Kurdistan. The Iraqi Comr believe that the Kurdish people's national problem in Iraq cannot be outside the context of the whole problem of revolutionary dem transformations in the country. The Party regards this as one of the chief of the Soviet experience in settling the nationalities question.

We are also interested in another problem bearing on political and equality, namely, that of the official language.

The language question is in general the key component of the legal and c aspects of the nationalities question. There can be no equality of nations w the right of all the big and small peoples, without exception, to receive inst in their native tongue, to use it in their state bodies, and so on.

The Constitution of the USSR does not contain any provisions on an language. But there is such a clause in the Constitution of the Azerbaija Article 151 says: "The Azerbaijanian language shall be the official lang the Azerbaijan SSR."

We feel that the law-makers of the Azerbaijan SSR had good reason t this article into the Constitution. After all, Azerbaijan has a clearcut n majority, which had never been an oppressor in the country's histor Azerbaijanian language is not the language of an oppressor nation. I Azerbaijan Constitution goes even farther and, in accordance with the L principles, secures the right of the national minorities. Article 151 goes o national minorities inhabiting the territory of the Azerbaijan SSR s assured of the right of free development and use of their native language

their cultural and in their government institutions." All the laws, decrees, resolutions and instructions issued by the bodies of power in the Republic are published in Azerbaijanian, Russian and Armenian, and this puts the Azerbaijanian language and the languages of the two main national minorities, the Russians and the Armenians, on an equal footing. Incidentally, all three languages are used in the publication of periodicals, radio and television broadcasts and instruction at school.

We asked Comrade Khalilov this question: "What is being done to develop the languages of the small peoples?"

K. Khalilov. Let us recall that Soviet state has developed alphabets for more than 50 small peoples of the Soviet Union, thereby preserving their national uniqueness and ensuring their development. Concerning the small languages in Azerbaijan, the problem is being tackled concretely in each case and, most importantly, on a purely voluntary basis. Thus, we have a village which is inhabited by mountaineer nationalities (known as the Daghestan nationalities), where 15 languages are spoken. So they had schools where instruction was given in all these languages. Now the inhabitants have decided that they don't need this arrangement. By contrast, in three districts of the Republic, where the Georgian (mainly rural) population is concentrated, instruction at school is being provided in the Georgian language at the request of the inhabitants.

S. Mitra. In a multinational state or in any country comprising different peoples, the problem of a one-language link is clearly a most important one. Otherwise peoples living in the same state would find it very hard to communicate and come closer together. In India, the English language of the colonialists had such a role to play for a long time. But time has shown that an lien tongue, imposed from outside, cannot become a native one. Hindi, which is poken by a sizeable part of India's population, is another matter. Our Party upports Hindi becoming the common, link language for the whole of India. But fter independence the government of the Indian National Congress attempted o decree Hindi as the official language, so violating the free-will principle, and his generated a tide of linguistic chauvinism among the non-Hindi-speaking eoples. The spread of Hindi was slowed down.

Here, in Azerbaijan, everyone we met used Russian right away, and this seems o be perfectly natural. Could this be an expression of the Russification about which so much has been written by our common opponents in the capitalist ountries?

K. Khalilov. Not at all. Everything hinges on Lenin's principle of free will and rust. He wrote: "And we (meaning the Bolsheviks—*Authors*), of course, are in avour of every inhabitant of Russia having the opportunity to learn the great Russian language. What we do not want is the element of *coercion.*" (*Coll. Works*, Vol. 20, p. 72.)

In the Soviet period, the Russian proletariat, the Russian people have won the rust of all the nations and nationalities of the Soviet Union, and this is reflected n their attitude to the Russian language. With the development of socialist ociety, it has naturally become, as Leonid Brezhnev put it, "a language in which ll the nations and nationalities of the Soviet Union communicate with each ther."

By Deeds, and Not by Slogans

We spent most of our time in Azerbaijan surveying its economy, its industrial nd agricultural enterprises. Our hosts made no secret of their pride: Azerbaijan

was among the winners of the All-Union emulation campaign every yea throughout the ninth five-year plan period. Nor was the first year of the new tenth five-year period an exception.

All of this has a direct bearing on our subject. The economic evening out of th various national territories is a key element of the Leninist policy of providin actual equality for the nations. In the Soviet Union, this has meant much faste development for the lagging national fringe areas of what was once tsaris Russia. Anyone who has kept track of developments in the Soviet Union will b aware of the tremendous growth of industrial production in the outlyin Republics, which has multiplied hundreds of times, and of the rapid growth o their agriculture.

Azerbaijan differed from nearly all the other non-Russian outskirts of tsaris Russia in that before the revolution its only developed industries were oi extraction and oil refining. That is why Azerbaijan's statistics do not contain th spectacular figures for industrial growth we find in the Central Asian republics where the growth is measured in hundreds of times. But these statistics are als impressive: by 1976, Azerbaijan's industry had grown 50-fold over the 1913 level But the important thing is that Azerbaijan has overcome its one-commodit structure, a symbol of backwardness. A modern industry with a diversifie structure has been built up through accelerated growth in other sectors. We fee that we must give, if only in a footnote, data helping to compare the presen condition of the Republic, not even with 1913, but with 1940, the last year befor the Nazi attack on the Soviet Union.[5]

In this context we recalled the claim in the above-mentioned *Economist* articl that the Russians, allegedly worried about the industrial growth of the outlyin Republics--and so of independence—intended to impose on them a one commodity economic structure, so as to rule out an urge for independence. Th article also claimed that, feeling the pressure of the population, which in th Central Asian Republics and Azerbaijan was growing faster than in Russia, th Soviet government intended to transfer the surplus manpower to—wher else?—Siberia! Here is one remark made by **E. G. Sarkisyan**, Secretary of th Nagorny Karabakh Party Regional Committee. The great population growth, h said, is a national feature of Azerbaijan. That is why the CPAz's Centra Committee has asked the CPSU Central Committee to consider the question o increasing industrial production in the 10th five-year period. Accordingly, 1 additional large-scale enterprises have been planned for the Republic, and thes will help to diversify production.

Sumgait, a city with a population of 190,000, which was founded 28 years ag in open country, ranks first in the Soviet Union in industrial potential pe inhabitant, and has an industry that could well be the envy of some countries tha are far from backward.

Another important feature of Azerbaijan's industrial development which along with diversification, has helped to change its face, is the balance geographical location of industry, and the elimination of lagging areas within th Republic itself through their accelerated development. Here one example wil suffice. Whereas in the past 10 years Azerbaijan's industrial output as a whole ha doubled, Nagorny Karabakh's has quadrupled.

While admiring Azerbaijan's achievements, we recalled bourgeois propaganda claims that all countries went through industrial growth, especially those that

ike Azerbaijan, had raw material resources, and that the socialist friendship of he nations had nothing to do with all this, and so asked this question: What are he advantages for Azerbaijan in being within an integrated state like the Soviet Jnion?

We received an answer from **A. G. Kerimov**, First Secretary of the Party's Baku City Committee and a member of the CPAz's CC Bureau:

I am not going to tell you the whole story of the assistance which Azerbaijan ias received above all from the Russian people and the peoples of the other Jnion Republics. I will confine myself to the latest example, which is the onstruction of an air-conditioner plant. This large-scale industrial project was tarted and completed in Azerbaijan in 1974 and 1975 by decision of the CPSU Central Committee. The enterprise and the building operations it required were n a tremendous scale. The Republic could never have coped with that kind of onstruction project on its own. The equipment, which was bought in Japan, lone cost $50 million. The construction itself cost 200 million rubles. Still, this lant, with the most modern technology, which makes it one of the biggest of its ind in the world, was started virtually 18 months after the beginning of onstruction. This called for assistance from all the Republics which provided quipment, blueprints, etc. I think that this example shows quite well the kind of dvantages Azerbaijan derives by being a member of the family of the fraternal Jnion Republics.

Apart from being an important element in effecting the actual equality of the arious peoples, and the result of their mutual assistance, the growth of large-cale industry also helps to shape the friendship of the peoples in yet another way, hat is, directly, for the working class in this multinational country is the main ehicle of internationalist consciousness and mentality.

We inspected many industrial enterprises, the kind which determine zerbaijan's new face, among them the Azerbaijan Tube-Rolling Mill named fter Lenin in Sumgait, the Serebrovsky Oil and Gas Extracting Administration ear Baku, the Air-Conditioner Plant in Baku and the Karabakh Silk Mill amed after the 26 Baku Commissars. They all have a multinational labour orce, consisting of men and women of 20, 30 and 40 nationalities, with 8 ationalities working together even in small outlying Karabakh. But the portant thing that attracted our attention, or amazed us to be more precise, as that the industrial and office workers themselves found the multinationality o problem at all.

Indeed, large-scale industrial production is the most efficient and natural eans of uniting the various peoples, and is the basis of the internationalist iendship of the Azerbaijan working people. But **K. M. Bagirov**, First Secretary f the Party's Sumgait City Committee, explained, this does not mean that we ave been letting things ride. The leadership of the Party organisation has never st sight of the need to work to strengthen the friendship among the working eople of different nationalities, and there are more than 70 of these in Sumgait. he Party's City Committee takes account of this fact when nominating men and omen for awards or election to the presidia of meetings. "We believe all of this is ghly important." "Have there been any incidents?" "Of course, the city's pulation is young and fluid, and things have not been smooth all the time." But e cases have been few and far between, involving individuals only.

Another aspect of the working people's internationalist education carried on

by the Party's City Committee is the effort to strengthen the friendship with t
other peoples of the Soviet Union. Sumgait maintains friendly contacts with t
Urals (Russia), with the cities of Rustavi (Georgia), Odessa (Ukraine) a
Kirovakan (Armenia). This fraternal friendship, Bagirov went on, exter
beyond the boundaries of the Soviet Union. We support internationalist ties w
the peoples of the other socialist countries. Not very long ago, a group of Cub
steel workers came to Sumgait to take part in a "friendship smelting".

We wondered about the state of the nationalities question in the rural areas.
India and Iraq, for instance, the peasants make up the overwhelming majority
the population. Because they are downtrodden and backward, and a
constantly subjected to fierce oppression by the landowners and feudal lords, t
peasants are especially receptive to nationalistic calls.

That was also the condition of Azerbaijan's peasants before the revolution,
were told by our hosts. That is why in a letter to the Communists of the Cauca
in April 1921, Lenin urged them to "make immediate efforts to improve t
condition of the peasants" (*Coll. Works,* Vol. 32, p. 318). This behest of Leni
has been completely fulfilled, and the trust of the peasants won, chiefly
switching the countryside to socialist lines and boosting agriculture at a fas
pace.

We saw the truth of this on every hand. We carried away some striki
impressions, for instance, from a visit to the Kommunist collective farm in t
Chartar village of Martuni District in the Nagorny Karabakh Autonomo
Region. It has a mechanised dairy farm, a club built of pink tufa seating 50C
library with 15,000 volumes, schools, a hospital and a polytechnic. The collect
farmers live in two-storey stone houses with all modern amenities.

In the countryside, the nationalities are not mixed as they are in the cities, a
the villages are mainly inhabited by people of one nationality. But as E.
Sarkisyan told us, in the old days Armenians and Azerbaijanians used to
friends on a personal basis, but today such friendships are the rule and a
reinforced with the friendship of whole villages and districts, where these m
and women know and, most importantly, help each other. We were told of ma
cases of mutual assistance, co-operation and just human friendly bonds betwe
Azerbaijan and Armenian villages.

Of course, a crucial factor here has been the abolition of exploitation, whi
generates all kinds of divisions, including national divisions, but the Part
sustained, day-to-day ideological and educational work also plays a tremendo
role.

It was in the Martuni district that we were told by V. M. Gabrielyan:

"The greatest accomplishment in the solution of the nationalities problem
that over here we no longer think about it. This means that we have no acute a
painful nationalities problem requiring special attention, and the Party sees to
that no such problems arise. National proportions are maintained in the Sovi
and the leadership of public bodies. The district committee also sees to it that
the villages, Armenian and Azerbaijan alike, are equally provided wi
telephones, roads, water-mains and other facilities. And the main thing,
course, is well-equipped schools with instruction in the native langua
—Armenian or Azerbaijanian."

We left Nagorny Karabakh, feeling that close attention in a Leninist spirit
the interests of every nationality, however small, has become ingrained in t

Soviet people, above all in its Communist Party.

We also drew the following conclusion, which is highly important for our own countries. The nationalities problem cannot be solved without the solution of the agrarian problem, without radical socio-economic transformations in the countryside. This will be seen in the national experience of Iraq, where reactionary feudal elements had taken over the leadership of the Kurdish national-liberation movement and, fearful of the agrarian reform announced by the Iraqi government, mounted an armed uprising against the autonomy of Iraqi Kurdistan. They refused to have autonomy under a progressive regime, even though they tried to cover up their unwillingness with nationalistic and anti-Communist slogans. This doomed the counter-revolutionary rising to failure. The Iraqi Communist Party is certain that the national problem of Iraq's Kurdish people can be properly solved through radical changes in agrarian relations and a revolutionary and democratic transformation of the whole country.

New Living Conditions

Much of what we have described shows how the question of actual equality in the social conditions of life and culture in Azerbaijan has been settled.

We could overwhelm the reader with the figures we were given about the number of doctors, hospitals, schools and pupils, higher schools and students, artists and research institutes, cultural and educational institutions, such as theatres, cinemas, museums, clubs, libraries, and so on. This was described to us in great detail by Azerbaijan's Minister of Culture Z. K. Bagirov. We can assure the reader that in all these areas Azerbaijan, one of the most backward parts of tsarist Russia, has now outstripped nearly all the most developed capitalist countries and even exceeds somewhat the average for the Soviet Union.

We should merely like to draw attention to a few matters which bear directly on our own countries.

First, in Azerbaijan the problem of national personnel has been solved. This we saw everywhere—at the industrial enterprises, on the collective farms, and in the government and Party institutions. No one made any secret of the fact that it has been solved with the Russian people's help. Indeed, this is a source of pride, and everyone we spoke to brushed aside with disdain the charges by hostile propaganda about "Russification". At the Azerbaijan State University, Professor Aslanov, Ph.D., told us: "We are grateful to the Russian people. They have set us on our feet, and then we learned to walk on our own."[6] The University (with over 6,000 students) has two sectors with lectures offered in Azerbaijanian and in Russian. They have common chairs, lecturers and curricula, and it is up to the students to choose the sector.

Second, the problems of education and personnel have been solved for all the nationalities, even the smallest. At the University we also asked about national quotas. We were told that there were no quotas now, that young men and women of the main nationalities were enrolled on an equal basis. However, there were very small nationalities—the Tsakhurs, Udins and Ingilois—and they had priority in enrolment.

This is so important for countries like ours, where many small nationalities have no access to higher education at all. In our countries, where the social system is different, national quotas would probably be necessary, and this not only in education.

Third, the question of women's equality, an important part of the nationalit question, has also been settled in Azerbaijan. We saw women everywhere: executive posts, in government and Party institutions, in schools and polyclini The relevant figures, which are highly convincing, will be found in any statistic book. We shall confine ourselves to two figures, which we were given by R. (Mamed-zade. He told us that women made up *32-33 per cent of the* membershi of the republic's Party organisation, and 30-35 per cent of the CPAz Centr Committee[7]. One-third of all Party district committee secretaries are wome And this we find in a country which for centuries was dominated by Islam, wit its traditional seclusion of women in the home.

However, the nation's progressive traditions and features are natural preserved, and are evidently most marked in the sphere of culture. Minist Z. Bagirov ended his colourful account, abounding in facts and figures (which w mentioned) on the flourishing of the national culture of Azerbaijan on a sociali basis, with these words: "We have created an Azerbaijan socialist nation culture, which is capable of solving its own internal national problems."

Just one more example. The Azerbaijan Opera House has a mugam secto The mugam is a specific Azerbaijan form of opera which is centuries old, an which used to exist only as folk art. Azerbaijan composers have invested it with classical character. Many mugam operas, like Uzeir Gadjibekov's famous Leila and Mejnoun, are part of the repertoire of the Azerbaijan Opera House and ar also performed with success in other Soviet cities, including Moscow Incidentally, amateur art groups are a form of folk art and are very popular a over the Republic.

This is a far cry from the notorious charge of "Russification". Both of us, wh come from the East, had good reason to feel at home in Azerbaijan, because it i an Eastern country, even if it does differ substantially from our own.

At the same time, it is here, in the sphere of culture, that the process of th interpenetration and integration of nations is most pronounced, for it i promoted by the constant cultural exchanges among the Republics. This is o exceptional importance. After all, the interpenetration and mutual enrichmer of cultures is an expression of the spiritual kinship of the peoples, and a important premise for the future integration of nations, which the CPSU ha always pursued as a goal in accordance with the Marxist-Leninist doctrine.

Religion, an important element in society's spiritual life, is also connected wit the question of national features and traditions. It is of especial importance fo our two countries. It was therefore most appropriate that we went to a countr with Moslem traditions. After all, Islam is the official religion in Iraq, and in India there are over 65 million Moslems (almost 12 per cent of the population), greater number of whom speak a separate language, Urdu. There is also a reason why the communalist (religious and chauvinistic) circles preached the theory o two nations in India. Here again, reactionary circles in capitalist and developin countries have poured much slander on the Communists' policy in the sphere o religion.

In Baku we visited the city's largest mosque, the Tazapir, where we me members of the Transcaucasian Moslem Religious Board, including Mufti Hadj Ismail Ahmedov.

We learned that the Soviet Union's general principle of separation of church from state also applies to Islam and that there is no harassment of believers. Le us note one important point: the financial agencies do not control the bankin

counts and operations of the Religious Board. We learned that the ntinuation of religious traditions and practices is a purely voluntary matter, id that the believers are not hampered in any way.

We were impressed by the active participation of practising Moslems in the country's public life and by their Soviet patriotism. The Mufti took part in the battle of Stalingrad, was awarded the medals "For Bravery" and "For the Defence of Stalingrad" and is very proud of his awards.

"Miracle" is perhaps the best word we could use to describe, without any exaggeration, our overall and chief impression of everything we saw in Azerbaijan. However, the heralds of imperialist propaganda and the reactionaries in our own countries frequently declare: "Why do you keep comparing the present situation in the Soviet Union with that of pre-revolutionary Russia, or—worst of all—with the period of economic dislocation after the Civil War? Nowadays, all countries have gone forward as compared with that period, especially with the period after the Second World War."

Accordingly, we decided to compare the situation in Soviet Azerbaijan with that in one of the countries which bourgeois propaganda has presented as a model of the "economic miracle" in the Third World, namely, Iran. We asked our colleague on the Editorial Council of the journal, Hamid Safari, who is a member of the Executive Bureau of the Central Committee of the People's Party of Iran, to tell us about the present state of Iranian Azerbaijan, his homeland. Comrade Safari kindly supplied us with information based on the official statistics issued by Iran's Central Bank.

The population of Soviet and Iranian Azerbaijan is roughly the same—over 5 million. They also had roughly the same starting level at the beginning of the 20th century. What about now?

	Soviet Azerbaijan	*Iranian Azerbaijan*
Number of industrial and office workers in the economy (wage-workers for Iranian Azerbaijan)	1,506,000 (1975)	1,050,000 (1973/74)
In agriculture	524,000	634,000
In industry	645,000	140,000
Literacy	100 per cent	In rural areas: 20-25 per cent; in cities, 40 per cent
Number of doctors per 10,000 inhabitants	28.9	3.6
Number of hospital beds per 10,000 inhabitants	100	4

Note 1. The 140,000 wage workers in Iranian Azerbaijan's industry are employed mainly at small enterprises, with under 10 employees. There are only 5 large enterprises employing up to 500 persons, and all are located in Tabriz, the only industrial city in the area.

Note 2. There are no polyclinics, hospitals, cultural or educational institutions in the rural areas of Iranian Azerbaijan at all.

Note 3. Iranian Azerbaijanians have no right to education in the native language. The existence of national cultural institutions, theatres, museums, and so on is ruled out. When a census is taken, the answer to the question of nationality is "Iranian". The Azerbaijanian language is regarded as a "dialect of Persian".

What more can one add to these facts?

The Problem is Solved, the Work Goes On

Consequently, the main idea emphasised by our hosts at every level was that the national question, in the form in which it was inherited from the past, has been completely settled, and settled once and for all. We saw for ourselves that this is quite true.

But this conviction and the formulation of the answer itself made us ask two questions, likewise at every level:

1. Does this mean that nothing remains to be done in the way of wiping out the legacy of the past?

2. In what sense or in what form has the national question still to be settled? What are the perspectives in this respect?

The answers we got emphasised the Communist Party's role in this key social process. This we have already described, but it is well worth returning to the subject.

The CPSU, the Bolshevik Party, has always been an international and internationalist party. Lenin always fought relentlessly against any attempts (which have been many in the Party's history) to separate the Communists of Russia in their "national quarters" (let us recall, for instance, his fight against the stand taken by the Bund), and took an uncompromising attitude to any expressions, however slight, of great-power chauvinism or nationalism. This is a key principle, and one of the main conditions for taking a correct approach to the solution of the nationalities problem in a multinational country, and it is still upheld by the CPSU.

We were highly impressed by the Party's cadres. In Azerbaijan we had an opportunity of meeting the first secretaries of Party organisations at virtually every level. They are very efficient, indeed, and merely laughed at the bourgeois propaganda claim that every "second secretary" is a Russian who makes all the decisions. Of course, there are Azerbaijanians, Armenians and Russians among the secretaries of the regional, city and district committees, but this is merely a reflection of the national composition of the population and the Party. Our main impression is that they work in a truly friendly, internationalist atmosphere.

They were not apprehensive of any of our questions, some of which sounded odd to them. They did not evade any of these questions.

One question which we frequently repeated had to do with something we had also frequently heard of, namely, the plenary meetings of Party organisations on internationalist education. We have been told that such plenary meetings are held regularly at every level, from the Central Committee of the Republic's Communist Party to the district committee, which were called to map out measures to correct mistakes and shortcomings in this area.

"What are these shortcomings if the national question has been settled?" we asked. "Why hold such meetings?"

The similar answers we were given in various regions and districts, cities and villages were best formulated by A. G. Kerimov, who said:

"First there is the objective need for correctly harmonising the interests of each nation with those of all Soviet people in our plans and in our day-to-day work. Relations between nations are a living and developing fabric, and the problems that they tend to produce need to be constantly and consistently tackled. But the main thing here, of course, is the practical and daily effort to continue bringing the nations closer together.

"Then there is the tenacity of the survivals of the past in the minds of men, in ıeir mentality.

"Finally, the hostile propaganda which our class adversaries seek to inject om outside is designed to fan nationalistic prejudices in an effort to erode the ıity of our country's peoples in some way."

We left Azerbaijan feeling tremendous respect for the Soviet Communists' any-sided and dedicated activity. Application of Lenin's principles has enabled e CPSU to perform a miracle which is not only political, economic and social, ıt spiritual as well. A revolution has taken place in the minds of men. One of the ost complicated problems in society's life, the problem of relations between ıtions, has actually been solved.

And another thing. We saw and sensed the role played by the Russian people in is spiritual integration, with its readiness to share all it has in order to render nuine assistance to the other peoples of the USSR. As a result, it has won their ›nfidence. This was well put by G. A. Aliev, alternate member of the CPSU :ntral Committee's Political Bureau and First Secretary of the CPAz Central ›mmittee, in his speech at the 25th Congress of the CPSU: "Today, on behalf of e Azerbaijan people, we voice our cordial gratitude to all the peoples of our ›untry, and to our elder brother, the great Russian people, for their ›interested assistance, for their friendship and brotherhood."

Final Questions Answered

Upon our return to Moscow, we were received by V. P. Ruben, Chairman of e Soviet of Nationalities of the USSR Supreme Soviet. He told us he was proud ' the solution of the nationalities problem, but added that it had yet to be fully ›lved.

We naturally asked him to explain what he meant, and how he saw the further 'olution of relations between Soviet nations. He said:

"The 20th Congress of the CPSU marked the start of a new stage in the aboration of the theory and practice of relations between the nations in the ›viet Union. This has run along two lines: first, an effort to put the facts and ıst experience into a system; and second, an effort theoretically to comprehend ›ntemporary processes and the prospects for the development of relations :tween the nations, especially in connection with the complete construction of ›cialism and the start of the construction of communism.

"The point is that the nationalities question cannot be separated from the life ' society, the specific features of the economic formation and the social ›nditions in which it has to live. As they change and the formation develops, ıere is also a change in the content of the nationalities question. Now that we ıve built full-scale socialism, we have a different working class, a different class ' collective farmers and a different intelligentsia. These are the chief ›mponents of any nation. They have been developing and we intend to record ıeir progress in the Constitution which is now being framed. Furthermore, ıtions also change with the interpenetration and mutual enrichment of their ıltures. Finally, the pace of life has been increasing, the volume of information 'owing, and man himself changing, and that, too, has an effect on the character ' the nations.

"Consequently, as social conditions change, the nations will go on developing ıd changing, and the friendship among them will grow stronger. Of course,

nations will not disappear overnight or even at the first stage of communist society. This means that the need for a nationalities policy and for the Party's work in this area will also remain, although their content will change together with the changing content of the nationalities question."

We have said that the nationalities problems of the Soviet Union and of the rest of the socialist community are a favourite target for subversive activity by the imperialist circles. The above-mentioned article in *The Economist* quoted Zbigniew Brzezinsky, who is now National Security Adviser to the US President, as saying that "within the rules of peaceful coexistence" the West should in a certain measure resort to "realistic encouragement of pluralism via nationalism and separatism" in the Soviet Union.[8] Ignoring for the moment the fact that such advocacy of interference in the domestic affairs of another country, to say nothing of the pretext of abiding by the principle of peaceful coexistence, is altogether intolerable, we asked ourselves: What does Brzezinsky expect in the final count? What kind of "real" separatism does he hope for?

It was this question of the actal purpose of such propaganda campaigns that we asked of Ruben. He replied briefly: "This is simply a malicious distortion of the facts. Bourgeois propaganda has been quick to speculate on the so-called Jewish question. But in the USSR the Jews fully enjoy all the national rights, and their national culture, in particular, has flourished. As for political equality, one need merely say that over 35,000 Jews (of a total population of 2.3 million) are now deputies to Soviets at various levels. Over the whole Soviet period, upwards of 120,000 citizens of Jewish nationality have emigrated from the Soviet Union. Let us note that over the past few years, the number of exist applications has dropped sharply. The same applies to the Volga Germans (about whose 'unhappy' lot, which is allegedly similar to that of the Jews, the bourgeois press has displayed so much concern): only 30,000 of a total of roughly 1.5 million persons have chosen to leave the USSR. So whenever any problems arise, they are solved."

Some Reflections

1. We have satisfied ourselves that the nationalities question in the Soviet Union has been completely solved through consistent implementation of the Leninist policy. The 60 years that have passed since the October Revolution are a short time yet such a great deal has been done in the most complicated area of human relations.

The solution has been achieved above all through the establishment of socialism, the new and advanced social system, but does that mean that we can do nothing in our own countries until socialism is built there, too? We feel that that would be the wrong approach.

First, as we have already said, when quoting Lenin, even under capitalism headway can be made in solving the nationalities problem through consistent democracy.

Second, the nationalities question has been and remains a part of the question of social revolution. For our countries, it has become a part of the question of the national democratic revolution. That is our parties' starting point in working out their stand on the concrete problems, like progressive transformations, autonomy, equality of the national languages, and so on.

Third, with neocolonialism banking on fanning national conflicts, chauvinism and separatism in our countries, making use of these attitudes against

rogressive forces, and the Communists in the first place, the nationalities uestion in our countries has become inseparable from the anti-imperialist truggle. Consequently, here again the Communists can and must successfully pply the strategy of the united anti-imperialist front.

2. We have seen for ourselves that despite all the distinctions in the content and orm of the solution of the nationalities question in the Soviet Union and in our ountries, the Soviet experience has clearly brought out some general laws. We elieve they include unqualified political equality of the nations; consistent emocracy of the system of government; actual equality—economic, social and ultural; democratic solution of language problems; decisive role of the working lass and its Party; concern for the peasantry; special concern for the small ationalities; observance of the principle of free will, tolerance and tact verywhere; and international unity of the Communists.

But, of course, these laws should not be applied mechanically but creatively, ith due account of local conditions.

3. We left Azerbaijan, convinced that these Leninist principles are correct and easible, for we had seen for ourselves that consistent implementation of the Leninist requirements of free will and equality, respect for national dignity and interests, and mutual assistance have developed into a rule of behaviour among Soviet people, which precludes any outbreaks of hostility between nations. We have seen that the Leninist policy has provided a basis on which numerous nations and nationalities have developed into a new historical entity, the Soviet people, an integrated people of a mulinational country united in building socialism and communism. We have witnessed the Soviet citizens' great common national pride.

4. We left Azerbaijan, enriched with an understanding of the importance of proletarian internationalism and its close connection with genuine patriotism. We realised how closely Soviet patriotism, socialist, proletarian internationalism, and solidarity with the working people and all the peoples of the world are interlinked in the minds of Soviet citizens. We realised their great determination to go on helping and supporting all fighters for social progress.

Anyone who has seen the Soviet Union's achievements gains tremendous optimism and inspiration in fighting for a new and better life for mankind.

---

[1] *Not long ago we read an article in The Economist,* March 19-25, 1977, which dealt with many things, including the nationalities question in the USSR. This reputedly solid British weekly voiced the futile hopes of the opponents of socialism for possible national strife in the Soviet Union. Later on in this survey we shall deal with some of the claims made by *The Economist.*

[2] The USSR comprises 15 Union Republics, 20 Autonomous Republics, 8 Autonomous Regions, and 10 National Areas.

[3] Let us note by way of comparison that the Ukrainian Republic, with a population of 49.1 million, has only 32 deputies in the Soviet of Nationalities, because it has no autonomous national territories within it, but has 150 deputies in the Soviet of the Union.

[4] Thus, of the 400 deputies elected to the Supreme Soviet in the Azerbaijan Republic in 1975, 315 are Azerbaijanians, 46 Russians, 28 Armenians, and so on. The more than 48,000 deputies to the local Soviets belong to over 35 nationalities.

[5] Azerbaijan's industrial growth rate (1975 up on 1940): all industry, 8.3-fold, including the fuel industry, 2-fold; chemistry and petrochemistry, 207-fold; power engineering, 9-fold; ferrous and nonferrous metallurgy, 1,810-fold; engineering and metal-working, 34-fold; the light industry, 5.7-fold; and the food industry, 5.7-fold.

[6] Before the revolution, 91 per cent of the population of Azerbaijan was illiterate; only 62 Azerbaijanians had a higher education. In the five years from 1971 to 1975, 80,000 specialists with a higher education were graduated in the Republic.

[7] *Women make up 37.7 per cent of the Supreme Soviet of the Azerbaijan SSR, and 45.74 per cent of* the local Soviets.

[8] *The Economist,* March 19-25, 1977, p. 63.

Helsinki and the Developing Countries

NAIM ASHHAB
CC member, Jordanian Communist Party, *WMR* Editorial Council member

ONE of the by no means unimportant results of the Helsinki Conference on Security and Co-operation is that it touched upon general aspects of the development of international relations not only in the European area, but also between Europe and the rest of the world. The provisions of the Final Act expressing the participants' desire to help the developing countries were greeted with interest on all continents. This interest will be even deeper now, on the eve of the Belgrade conference, which is to review fulfilment of the Helsinki accords.

What makes this matter so topical in the eyes of the peoples of the developing countries? The answer to that question probably lies in analysis of the progress made in fulfilling the provisions of the Final Act reflecting the explicit aspirations of hundreds of millions of people across Asia, Africa and Latin America. These provisions come under three headings. First, the provisions on the economic problems of the less developed countries; second, the agreements on promoting security outside Europe; and, third, what is said in the Final Act about guaranteeing the sovereign rights of the peoples.

The peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America regard fulfilment of the Helsinki accords not only as a way of strengthening peace, facilitating political detente and moving on to military detente, but also as an extremely important factor that could help to reshape the economic relations formed in the days of colonialism between capitalist Europe (as well as the United States and Canada, the non-European parties to the agreement) and the former colonies and semicolonies. However, the imperialist powers have shown no more desire since Helsinki than they did before the conference to change this unequal and obsolete system.

Take, for example, the prices of raw materials and semi-manufactured goods exported to the capitalist world market from the developing countries. Monopoly dictation on the world market has in recent years led to sharp declines (for instance, in 1975-76), while the prices of industrial exports from capitalist countries have been growing. This, and not the rise of oil prices, which even today are still less than they should be, is one of the main reasons for the grave financial position of many of the young countries. As for oil prices, whereas in 1973 they were set at a fairer level as against those of the main industrial goods on the capitalist market,[1] inflation has been virtually wiping out all the increases since 1973. Western Europe and the US are trying to block any attempt by the developing countries to close the gap between the prices of their raw materials and those of manufactured goods from the capitalist states.

While supporting in every way the reactionary regimes that govern some of the developing countries, the ruling circles of the major capitalist powers use them to mount an obstructionist posture whenever there is any real discussion about changing the unequal economic relations with the developing countries as a

whole. In a year and a half of negotiation at the Paris conference on international economic co-operation not one of the proposals from the group of 19 developing countries was accepted because of the various roadblocks erected by the capitalist countries.

So the question naturally arises: How is all this to be squared with the obligation to fulfil the provisions of the Helsinki document calling for removal of barriers to the development of international trade, for efforts to establish stable international economic relations?

In our view, it is quite obvious that dictation of prices and the policy of perpetuating the backwardness of the developing countries pursued by the major capitalist powers are in deep contradiction with the understanding reached at Helsinki that the participating countries "will take into account the interest of all in the narrowing of differences in the levels of economic development, and in particular the *interest of developing countries* throughout the world" (My italics, *N. A.*). This line has been severely criticised in the developing countries themselves and at many prestigious international gatherings. The Prime Minister of Sri Lanka, Sirimavo Bandaranaike, said at the Fifth Conference of the Non-Aligned Movement (August 1976), that the vagaries of the world market and the manipulations of the international financiers are causing a constant fall in the real value of the products of the developing countries.[2] At the same time, the gap is widening in relations between the imperialist powers and most of the developing countries. There is also a huge gulf in per capita incomes. Such is the unhappy outcome of the policies pursued by capitalist Europe, by the imperialist countries as a whole towards the developing countries.

The Helsinki agreements binding the signatories of the Final Act to conduct a policy of peace and detente in Europe and other parts of the world deserve special attention. I would note one of the most important propositions of this document, which reads that "security in Europe is to be considered in the broader context of world security and is closely linked with security in the Mediterranean area as a whole, and that accordingly the process of improving security should not be confined to Europe but should extend to other parts of the world, and in particular to the Mediterranean area".

These impressive words of the Final Act express the participating countries' belief in the need for peace efforts in other areas besides Europe. Unfortunately, however, the United States and capitalist Europe are inclined to regard this as mere words carrying no specific commitment. They whip up the arms race there and steer a course not towards detente but a build-up of tension.

The United States and other imperialist powers are encouraging Israel's aggressive inclinations by enabling her to maintain a high level of armaments. What is more, France and Federal Germany are themselves buying arms from Israel and in the autumn of 1976 the purchase of Israeli fighter aircraft by Austria was announced. Thus the Israeli arms industry is receiving additional growth stimuli.[3]

The United States (also a signatory of the Final Act) is delivering huge consignments of arms to the reactionary regimes of the Persian Gulf. This further increases the threat of new military clashes and general instability in Western Asia.

The imperialist powers are taking a similar line in regard to the Republic of South Africa. Because of the constant violations of the UN General Assembly

resolutions banning arms deliveries to the racist regime, the Fifth Conference of Non-Aligned Countries called for an embargo on oil deliveries to France and Israel. Ending the arms race in the Middle East and in other parts of Asia and Africa and the international armaments trading in general have become an urgent problem demanding serious attention.

The imperialist powers bear the responsibility for the real danger that proliferation of nuclear weapons presents to the world today. Their support has given the reactionary regimes in South Africa and Israel, which pursue policies of expansion and aggression against their peaceful neighbours, the opportunity of building up their own nuclear weapon industries. Through collaboration with France and Federal Germany in the nuclear field Israel has made substantial advances towards creating its own nuclear weapon and its leaders declare again and again either that it already possesses such a weapon or is capable of producing it when needed. There is a danger that Brazil may gain access to the atomic bomb.

So, in glaring contrast to the noble aims proclaimed at Helsinki, a perilous course is being steered towards creation of new military-political bastions of imperialism. All this increases tension and the danger of armed conflict, and undermines the peace efforts of both the socialist and non-aligned countries, which are striving to spread detente to all continents.

The United States and the leading powers of capitalist Europe have treated as no more than good intentions those provisions of the Helsinki conferences that express the intention of the participating states to respect the principle of equal rights and self-determination, the right of all peoples to determine their internal and external political status in full freedom, without external interference. Time and again the imperialists of the USA and Europe resort to policies of interference in the affairs of other countries, as illustrated, for example, by the history of the crisis in Lebanon. The actions of the ultra-right forces that brought Lebanon to the verge of disruption and collapse were to a considerable extent made possible by the lavish arms deliveries that they constantly received from the USA, France and the FRG. The French ruling circles provoked the secession of Mayotte (Comoro Islands) in order to keep this legitimate territory of the young Comoro state permanently tied to France. The latest example of a policy alien to the letter and spirit of the Helsinki accords is interference by a number of imperialist powers in the internal conflict in Zaire, with the resultant real threat of foreign invasion in neighbouring Angola. The USA and France bear special responsibility for the emergence of this dangerous centre of tension. The US immediately sent in a million dollars' worth of equipment. France has organised the transportation to Zaire not only of military equipment, but also of Moroccan troops for punitive operations against the insurgent population of Shaba province, and (like Belgium) has also dispatched military instructors. Certain West European governments and NATO have been urging some other African countries to interfere in the affairs of Zaire—those that have given military and other aid to the Zaire regime and shown their willingness to be led by imperialism.

The imperialists more and more frequently resort to the use of mercenaries, most of them citizens of West European countries and the USA, for interference in the affairs of the young states, especially the African ones. This happened in Angola, and it is happening in Zaire and Zimbabwe. In capitalist Europe plans

for resettling 150,000 whites from Namibia, Zimbabwe and the RSA to Bolivia are being drawn up at state level. One of the aims is to bolster the reactionary regime there with racist help.

The plot against Bonin, when imperialist mercenaries, Europeans and Africans, invaded the territory of that country, was hatched in Western Europe. The security service of the Comoro Islands recently uncovered a similar conspiracy. If preparations for armed invasion and other similar acts of interference in the affairs of sovereign states proceed unhindered in certain West European states, responsibility for this lies with their governments.

To sum up, the policies of the United States and a number of major capitalist states of Europe increasingly contradict the noble aims vis-a-vis the developing countries written into the Final Act of the Helsinki Conference.

The socialist countries of Europe have throughout these years pursued a fundamentally different policy. And as regards their attitude to the developing countries, there is no contradiction or discrepancy between the aims proclaimed at Helsinki and the foreign policies of the socialist countries.

This is made quite clear, for example, by the socialist countries' co-operation with the developing countries. The progressive orientation and mutually beneficial character of this co-operation are an important reason for the growing interest of the less developed countries in building up varied connections with socialist Europe. Three decades ago for example, they started from almost nothing, but in the period from 1960 to 1974 the external trade of the CMEA member countries with the developing countries increased more than six-fold—from 1,700 million rubles to 10,500 million rubles. In 1970-75 it increased 2.3-fold, including a 13.4 per cent increase in 1975.

The facts show that, as in the past, the socialist states lay the main stress in their co-operation with the emergent countries on industries whose development is decisive for achieving economic emancipation.[4] This policy effectively helps to eliminate their economic lag and fully accords with the letter and spirit of the Helsinki accords.

The Soviet Union and other socialist countries have shown understanding and appreciation of the emergent countries' programme for a "new international economic order". It is expressive of their legitimate desire to extend the process of decolonisation to the economic sphere, lay the foundations for freedom from exploitation by the industrialised capitalist powers and provide favourable conditions for overcoming their economic backwardness.[5] With this aim in view, the developing countries are working for integrated measures to change the existing structure of international economic relations, under which they remain an object of discrimination and oppression by the capitalist countries. The Soviet government's statement on restructuring international economic relations supports the underlying principles of a broad programme of measures expressive of the developing countries' vital and long-term interests.

The international policy of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries fully accords with the principles of self-determination and equality of nations reaffirmed in the Final Act. This has been clearly demonstrated by the recent visit to Tanzania, Zambia, Mozambique and Somalia of Nikolai Podgorny, President of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, and the visit to a number of African countries of Fidel Castro, Chairman of the State Council and the Council of Ministers of Cuba. Both visits were a powerful demonstration of the

socialist world's solidarity with the peoples of Africa and made it perfectly clear that, in striving for the complete and final elimination of colonialism and racialism, the socialist countries are resolved to help these peoples uphold their cherished ideas of national and social liberation and will do everything for the triumph of freedom.

In the Middle East, too, the Soviet Union is pursuing a policy of strengthening and protecting the national sovereignty of the countries of this region and the sovereign rights of their peoples. The Soviet demand for the withdrawal of Israeli forces from all Arab territory occupied in 1967 is vivid evidence of that. The Soviet Union and the European socialist countries are exerting much effort to help the Arab people of Palestine exercise their legitimate rights to self-determination and the establishment of their own state, whereas the United States and other capitalist countries have denied them that right, as evidenced, primarily, by non-recognition of the Palestine Liberation Organisation, the only lawful representative of the Palestine people. In addressing the 16th USSR Trade Union Congress, Leonid Brezhnev, General Secretary of the CC CPSU, proposed a detailed and all-embracing plan for a Middle East settlement, defining its main principles and directions, which accord with the interests of all the peoples and states of the region. The importance of that speech was emphasised by Yassir Arafat, Chairman of the PLO Executive. His meeting with Leonid Brezhnev during the visit to Moscow of a PLO delegation (April 1977) was of truly historic significance.

Since Helsinki, the European socialist countries have continued to hold the initiative in promoting a climate of peace and detente in various parts of the world. But the success of these peace initiatives depends also on the reaction of the leading capitalist states, primarily the USA. So far, however, the approach of this biggest capitalist power to the problems of peace and disarmament reveals little that is positive. Indeed, one can discern persistent attempts to gain unilateral strategic advantages at the expense of the security of the USSR and its allies. Naturally, the Soviet Union categorically rejects such an approach.

While imperialist policy breeds conflicts in various parts of Asia and Africa, socialist Europe is doing everything it can to make its contacts with the developing countries a reliable factor for world peace. The Soviet Union and other socialist countries have shown a deep understanding of the peace initiatives taken by these countries—for instance their proposals to make the Indian Ocean a zone of peace—speak out against the setting up of new military bases there and the policy of international imperialism. And though the imperialists accuse the Soviet Union of maintaining military bases in some Afro-Asian countries, their accusations are unfounded. We have only to recall the fabrications about "a Soviet military presence", even "bases", in Somalia and Mozambique. The leaders of these sovereign states have repeatedly, on the basis of incontestable facts, exposed this ill-intentioned imperialist slander.

The socialist countries' policy on nuclear-free zones in various parts of the world has likewise met with a favourable response in Asia and Africa. The socialist representatives at the 31st UN General Assembly supported resolutions calling for such zones in Africa and the Middle East. The Soviet Union has proposed to the USA withdrawal from the Mediterranean of all Soviet and American vessels and submarines carrying nuclear weapons in order to reduce the tension in this area.

\ll these facts are proof of the socialist countries' commitment to peace, their ;ere desire to make detente a continuous, all-embracing process. And that, as know, is one of the key provisions of the Helsinki accords.

'he Final Act of the European Conference is a long-term programme that not be carried out in a year or two. But agreements are agreements. And as far the developing countries are concerned (regardless of their differing ıctures), failure to implement these agreements would have a most adverse ct upon them, for it would aggravate their economic difficulties and ›ardise peace and security in various parts of Asia, Africa and Latin America. s is why materialisation of the Final Act provisions is of such importance for n. And its guarantee lies in concerted action on the international scene by the :es of world socialism and national liberation, by all the forces committed to :e and democracy.

\s a result of measures taken by the oil-producing countries in connection with the fourth Arab-·li war (October 1973).

;ee *International Herald Tribune*, August 17, 1976.

sraeli ruling circles are also seeking US permission to supply Ecuador with Kfir fighter bombers uced by Israel and equipped with American engines.

·or instance, 38 production units in iron and steel, 74 in energy, 53 in engineering and metal cing, 33 in oil extraction and refining, over 30 in building, about 150 in the light, food and other stries, have been built, or are being built, with Soviet assistance. They will annually produce it 16 million tons of iron, nearly 18 million tons of steel, more than 15 million tons of rolled metal, it 350,000 tons of aluminium, more than three million tons of cement, more than 500,000 tons of ·ral fertiliser, more than 53 million tons of oil and about 20 million tons of oil products. Power rating capacity will amount to nearly 11 million kw.

·or more details see K. Olszewski's article, "Socialist Economic Integration and International tions", in *WMR*, May 1977.

Party Experience

Economic Analysis and Political Decisions

JEAN VINCENT
Chairman, Swiss Party of Labour

LY *a few years ago people high up in government and business were under the* ;ion that the crisis which had gripped the main centres of the capitalist world ıld somehow bypass Switzerland. And only our Party of Labour warned that is developments in our economy and in our society were inevitable.

he problem of the world capitalist crisis and how it affects Switzerland has ıy aspects. One of them is closely linked with the dialectic of the general and particular in modern history. For we know that the idea is widely current that tzerland is "not like" other capitalist countries. For years the conviction has ı instilled in the public mind that Switzerland is not an actor on the world ,e, but merely a spectator, a disinterested observer who counts the blows and er condemns or approves. Ruling-class ideologists seek solace in the hope

'anscript of an interview Comrade Vincent gave a *WMR* correspondent in Geneva in January.

that Switzerland will be able to withdraw into self-isolation and avoid the calamities besetting world capitalism and imperialism, that Switzerland can remain in the nineteenth century," or at any rate return to it.

It is therefore especially important to make people realise that capitalist Switzerland, for all the peculiarities of its economic and political structure and history, is subject to the basic laws of capitalist development. Without disregarding national specifics, our Party has repeatedly emphasised in its policy statements that Switzerland is part of the world capitalist system, is closely tied in with international imperialism, that its economic and political development is governed by the laws of capitalist economy and imperialist policy.

It was from this standpoint that we analysed the crisis of the 70s. At the Brussels Conference of Communist and Workers' parties of capitalist Europe early in 1974, we described this crisis as exceptionally profound and all-embracing. And we stressed that the crisis had not only economic, but also political and moral aspects. In June 1974 we repeated this assessment at our Tenth Party Congress in Basle. At that time spokesmen of international big business and of our own ruling class maintained that Marxist-Leninist criticism of capitalism was obsolete. We, however, had every reason to state that the march of events had fully corroborated our theory. I repeat, we were the first to warn of the impending crisis, and subsequent events were to show that we were right and the believers in Swiss "exclusiveness" wrong. In 1975 output declined by 13 per cent and investment by 7,800 million francs. The number of jobs declined by 200,000 between April 1973 and the close of 1976. Imports were down by 20 per cent.

Of course, our prediction of a drastic deterioration of the economic and social situation was based not on some oracular prescience, but on a scientific analysis of the state of affairs in the capitalist world and particularly in our own country. This led us to conclude that, in many respects, the crisis in Switzerland would manifest itself differently than in other capitalist countries.

That is precisely what happened. Take the problem of employment. According to official statistics, there are 14,000 fully unemployed though, as noted above, the number of jobs has decreased by 200,000. This paradoxical disparity is due, first, to the wide spread of partial unemployment, i.e. large numbers of workers being put on short time. Second, many women and pensioners found themselves compelled to give up their jobs. Yet neither of these two categories is included in the unemployment statistics.

Third, and most important, about 100,000 foreign workers have quit the country, or, to be more exact, since most of them were seasonal workers, did not return for the new season and swelled the unemployed army in their own countries, particularly Italy and Spain. Swiss capitalism has been able to ease the employment situation by exporting unemployment.

The relatively low level of unemployment does not, therefore, mean that Swiss capitalism has avoided excessive unemployment by astute management of the economy. On the one hand, the employment situation, in this time of crisis, is less tense than, say, in the EEC countries, and this is due to some specific features of our national economy. On the other hand, it reveals Switzerland's organic link with the entire capitalist economic mechanism.

Or another example, inflation. It is generally known that in this respect Switzerland has fared better than other countries. Last year prices rose by 1.2-1.3

ent, compared with 16 per cent in Britain and Italy, 15 in France and 11 for Common Market. The exchange rate of the Swiss franc is up 60 per cent on 971. Switzerland therefore has to exert less effort and use less resources to assure in adequate supply of imported raw materials, food, and so on. Clearly, this is evidence of Swiss capitalism's "durability". It is also evidence of a specific position in a crisis-ridden capitalist world. But the homogeneous social essence of capitalism, whether in our own country or neighbouring West-European countries, makes itself felt whenever the workers press their demands for higher wages to counter higher prices. In other countries they are told: higher wages will only mean still higher prices. In Switzerland they are told: don't grumble, you are better off than in any other country.

A number of things have to be taken into account in analysing the crisis in Switzerland. For instance, the role of banks in the national economy. In 1975, notwithstanding the output decline mentioned above, bank deposits rose by 7,000 million francs to reach a figure twice as large as our gross national product. Investments at home have decreased, but investments abroad have risen by 34,000 million francs, or by 40 per cent. The 1975 balance of payments showed surplus of 6,700 milion francs, and exports rose by 5.4 per cent. These figures how that, despite the crisis, Swiss capitalism has made a handsome profit out of ts special position in the world capitalist economy.

Crisis phenomena in the production sphere have had the most adverse effect on the export industries, primarily the manufacture of watches. In the Neuchatel anton, the centre of the watch industry, the number of jobs is down by 7,000 and he outlook is for a further decline of 10,000. At the close of 1976 the engineering ndustry registered a decline in production, orders and profit margins. Serious omplications have arisen also in printing; there has been a sharp (40 per cent) rop in building, but a visible rise in textiles.

These and other developments squarely pose the problem of restructuring the Swiss economy. Big business wants to solve it in a way that would further its nterests. The watch industry bulletin recently declared that new bankruptcies were quite normal, for, it argued, they remove the "incompetents" that merely ame up on the wave of the recent boom. The real purpose, of course, is to houlder out the small and middle companies and thereby deliberately and ctively stimulate the process—quite natural under capitalism—of production oncentration and centralisation of capital. That policy is being pursued also by mployers' associations in other industries.

Indeed, the government is following the same course, clearly demonstrating hat it serves the interests of big business. This has to be stressed because the men who speak for the bourgeoisie have gone to great pains to depict the state as a eutral institution vis-a-vis the various social forces.

The employers' associations—the *patronat*—has set out the aims of its conomic strategy as follows: free play of market forces, safeguarding the conomic order based on private initiative and responsibility, preference for ndividual over collective enterprise, independence of the cantons from the entral authority. This is a thinly veiled appeal to demobilise the state and restrict ts economic role. In other words, in this age of state-monopoly capitalism, the uling class reaffirms its allegiance to *laissez faire*, to the free play of market orces. Interesting? Yes, for in this we have another feature of the social and conomic climate in Switzerland and how it differs from that of neighbouring ountries.

But it does not follow that the Swiss state stands above classes. On th
contrary, it is a political organism closely associated with big business, a servan
of the big bourgeoisie. Our Party has drawn special attention to that in the thes
it approved in Lausanne in 1971.

The economic demobilisation which big business is so anxious to bring abou
is class-oriented. For instance, the man who until recently was the head of th
patronat is quoted for this statement: social-service expenditure should be born
by those who benefit from it, not the state. And that is how things stand toda
the share of the state, the central government, the Swiss Confederation in social
service expenditure *has been steadily declining while contributions by th
population have been steadily increasing. Or take taxes: the accent has alway*
been on indirect taxation, with the result that the tax on high incomes and bi
fortunes remains stable while taxes on consumer goods are constantly rising.

The special feature of Switzerland, therefore, is not that its bourgeoisie i
resisting state intervention in the economy out of self-interest, but that state
monopoly capitalism in our country started developing rather late and is
asserting itself more slowly than in other countries.

Finally, in assessing the peculiarities of the crisis situation in our country i
should be remembered that Switzerland has not been at war for more than one
and a half centuries and has known none of its destruction, death and tribulation
On the contrary, the military conflicts beyond its borders, particularly the two
world wars, made Switzerland richer. It was able to improve its production
capacity while that of other countries was being blasted. After the first and
second world wars it was stronger economically than it had been before them.

Add to this the fact that for thirty years Switzerland has lived in favourable
market conditions, without recessions, unemployment or strikes. Incidentally,
the absence of strikes does not mean that there are no conflicting relations
between workers and employers. This is the result of a special contract between
the reformist trade unions and the *patronat*, known as the peaceful labour
contract, which has a special clause prohibiting strikes.

To sum up, Switzerland occupies a special place in the capitalist world. Its
economic structure, political system, history and traditions often give rise to
situations that are difficult to compare with the situation in other lands, even our
closest neighbours. But this concerns mainly the specific forms of life in our
society and not the basic laws of capitalism, to which Switzerland is subject not
less than any other capitalist country. The present crisis does not follow what
might be called the classical pattern. It does not mirror the crisis of the thirties. Its
manifestations are not so obvious as in other countries. It is largely hidden,
disguised by local peculiarities. But, in the final analysis, it is biting deep into the
most fundamental sides of our social life and can quite adequately be defined on
the basis of the theories propounded by the founders of Marxism, who assessed
such situations as the rebellion of the forces of production against production
and property relations, against a doomed social system.

This is bound to play a major part in determining the prospects of our social
development. On the other hand, even today it is piling up difficulties and
creating urgent problems, social and political as well as economic. The ruling
class is constantly trying to shift the burden of the crisis on to the workers'
shoulders. It is attacking their political gains, the democratic rights won by the
people.

Ours is a country of democratic traditions that took shape in the conditions of ıpitalist society. But these traditions are often broken or forgotten. The rovisions of the Constitution are often far removed from what happens in ality. Nevertheless, since 1848 the Swiss people have had a emocratic—bourgeois-democratic, of course—constitution. Specifically, our olitical system provides for the right of popular legislative initiative. With),000 signatures under it, any new law that is proposed must be put up for public scussion. A proposal to change the constitution becomes the subject of a ıtional referendum if it has the support of 50,000 citizens. Today, however, the ruling circles are trying to double the number of signatures required in such cases. They also want to reduce the period allowed for collection of signatures. This is being done to hamper the activities of the opposition forces and minimise their chances of success in any struggle with the ruling class and its parties.

Or take, for example, the campaign launched against civil servants and teachers who hold left-wing views. It is highly reminiscent of the *Berufsverbot* in the FRG. This is part of a general pattern. The bourgeois ruling class always resorts to restrictions on democracy when it finds this possible and profitable from the political or economic point of view, particularly in the present crisis situation.

What is the policy of our Party in this situation? What aims do we set ourselves?

At our Tenth Congress we stressed that it is our aim, as the name of our party requires, to be genuine representatives of the working people, of their interests and aspirations, and tomorrow of their will at state level. Working in an era that was launched sixty years ago by the October Revolution, we are constantly aware of the acceleration in the march of history. Moreover, we consider it our duty not merely to observe events but to play a direct part in them, to build a new world, at least on a scale consonant with that of our country and our own potential.

As we have often emphasised in our Party documents and at international gatherings, we cannot envisage the building of socialism in Switzerland in any other way than with the consent of the mass of the people, as a result of their own actions, and without any interference "from above", "from outside", from any "active minorities", and so on.

On the road to socialism the Swiss Party of Labour intends to rely on the country's democratic institutions. We shall give them real substance, we shall protect and develop them to the maximum. Protecting them, as I have said, is a problem that faces us already.

Our primary aim, then, is to win over to our side the broadest sections of the people. Within this general aim our first concern, of course, is to achieve unity of action among the working class. Secondly, we want an alliance of Left forces and, thirdly, we must unite the broad masses.

The difficulties we encounter are formidable. Many of them derive from the peculiar features of the economic and political structure of our country. I will give two examples, Switzerland is very little centralised as a state. Each of the 22 cantons has its own constitution, its own laws. This means that the Party of Labour must be constantly alive to local conditions and careful in drafting policy at canton as well as national level. In addition, all work has to be conducted in the three national languages. While the high cost of living and the crisis-ridden state of the printing industry have lately led to the closing of several capitalist

newspapers, we are still managing to put out a daily newspaper in French, and weeklies in German and Italian. This is something to be proud of, but in present circumstance this by no means easy task puts a tremendous strain on our party's resources.

Another thing that hinders our work is Switzerland's specific social and economic features. According to the latest statistics (1970), its working population is made up of 230,000 farmers, 1,129,000 industrial workers and 1,313,000 people employed in other spheres. Geneva, for instance, is a politically developed city, a city where our Party's positions are particularly strong, where it has even beaten other parties at the polls. But out of the 180,000 people working in Geneva only 36,000 are employed in industry, while 127,000 work in commerce, banks, insurance companies, transport, hotels, restaurants, administrative institutions, health and education services, and international organisations. In other words, the proportion of actual proletarians, industrial workers that directly create surplus value, is very small, far less than in other developed capitalist countries. It will be appreciated how this influences the social profile of the masses, what difficulties it creates for us in getting through to the population.

Nevertheless we are entitled to claim a measure of success. Admittedly the picture is not the same all over the country. In French-speaking Switzerland we have maintained firm positions, and in the Italian-speaking part they have even slightly improved. Unfortunately this cannot be said of the cantons where German is spoken.

A fruitful result of our unity policy is that in French-speaking Switzerland we have been able to build up a relationship with the socialists. We hold joint discussions and sometimes our positions come closer together. We have even gone as far as making electoral agreements. We had such agreements in the Vaud and Geneva cantons and they were observed by both sides. A similar agreement is in the pipeline for the canton of Neuchatel. This is important because it is an industrial, working class canton. It should be stressed that the unity we are achieving in French-speaking Switzerland is not just unity of action on some specific subject. Here something like a permanent alliance of left-wing forces is emerging.

We are not losing hope of getting co-operation with the socialists in the German part of the country as well, first through joint action on the shop floor and then indirectly at inter-party level.

As for wider mass unity, I will give one example. A movement is under way in Geneva for a genuinely democratic housing policy, for the building of flats whose cost would come within the means of families with modest incomes. This movement is supported by our Party, the Socialists, the Christian Democrats, trade unions of various colourings, and the tenants associations. We regard the participation of the Party of Labour in such movements as an important way of realising our principle of uniting the masses in the struggle for the future socialist transformation of Swiss society.

For the same purpose we are trying to use the mechanism of popular initiatives, which, as I have indicated, is a special feature of the Swiss political system. This year or next there is to be a national vote on proposals initiated by our Party and providing for:

—control of prices and profits;

—introduction of control over trusts and cartels, including their possible nationalisation;

—democratic tax increases on high incomes and large estates.

We are thus actively and consistently standing up for the interests of the workers, the working people, all sections and groups of the population that are in any way oppressed or exploited by big capital. We make use of various spheres and forms of political activity—parliamentary, at confederation and canton level, the mechanism of popular initiatives and referendums, mass movements for achieving specific social aims, and so on.

In carrying out our unity policy we are guided by definite principles formulated in our programme document—the 1971 theses. This document *stressed that in the campaign to bring the masses together in a broad popular* movement the Party of Labour should retain its own face and work to improve the political consciousness of its members. On the one hand, there is to be no isolationism, veiled by a mis-conceived notion of "ideological purity". On the other, we must not allow ourselves to be tempted by the road of futile reformism. The Party of Labour wants everything it does to raise the general level of the struggle and contribute to the overall task of advancing towards socialism.

In conclusion, I should like to repeat something that was said at our Tenth Congress. Namely, that the Party of Labour is the only organised force in our country that is waging a consistent struggle against capitalism, and for the fundamental remoulding of our society, for a new, socialist Switzerland. This role makes the Party of Labour an essential and indispensable factor in the national political life.

In Brief

ANGOLA

The first national Party school has opened in the republic. It will equip Party cadres with a sound knowledge of Marxism-Leninism and train them to take an active part in socialist construction, Students will be taught political economy, Marxist philosophy and the history of the People's Movement for the Liberation of Angola (MPLA). The opening ceremony was attended by Political Bureau members of the CC MPLA, members of the government and PRA leaders.

ARGENTINA

In spite of a complicated domestic political situation, the Communists, working people, democrats and progressives are preparing for a fitting celebration of the glorious 60th anniversary of the Great October. This is stated in a lecture by Geronimo Arnedo Alvarez, General Secretary of the CPA, published in Buenos Aires. "No event", the author says, "has had so beneficial an impact on world development as the 1917 socialist revolution. It initiated the epoch of the transition from capitalism to socialism, whose standard-bearers are the peoples of the socialist community. It afforded millions of exploited and

oppressed people all over the planet vast opportunities for struggle." G. Alvarez points out that on January 6, 1978, or 57 days after the celebration of t 60th anniversary of October, the workers and people of Argentina w commemorate the 60th anniversary of the CPA (originally called t International Socialist Party). The rise of the working-class party in Argenti was inseparable from the names of its founders, Victorio Codovilla and Rodol Ghioldi. For us, G. A. Alvarez says, the two anniversaries "merge into one a serve the defence of world peace against the imperialist policy of war, the defen *of the first socialist country and the first socialist revolution, which ushered in* new era in man's history".

COLOMBIA

The Communist Party of Colombia has held its Sixth National Conference discuss organisational matters. The conference put on record a substanti growth of the Party, an increase in its propaganda and educational activity, anc strengthening of its financial situation. Gains in propaganda express themselv among other things, in the increased distribution of the Party's nation newspaper, *Voz Proletaria*, whose weekly circulation in 1976 averaged 43,0 copies. The main item on the agenda was measures to speed the growth of t Party by using current opportunities. The conference stressed that now as in t past the main task was to reinforce the Party numerically and improve i composition. It indicated the steps to be taken to this end and criticised mistak that had hampered its achievement.

FRANCE

FCP General Secretary Georges Marchais has spoken to a CC meeting "Advancing to Democratic Changes". In analysing the outcome of the late municipal elections, he said that it was evidence of a general retreat of the Rig The Left had gained everywhere. It had won the elections in 56 big cities a hundreds of other communities.

French society was going though a crisis affecting every sphere of public li The country needed far-reaching changes. The domination of big capital must undermined to pave the way for a thorough democratisation in the econom social and political spheres. The government programme signed by the Left 1972 was in keeping with these tasks.

Paul Laurent, member of the Political Bureau and Secretary of the CC FC noted in his speech that by the end of 1976 the Party membership had reach 543,000. In the first three months of this year, 50,000 people had joined the Part

MEXICO

The purpose of the Left alliance whose formation has been announced is bring about social and economic changes through united action. The allian comprises the Mexican Communist Party, Mexican Party of Working Peopl Revolutionary Socialist Party, left wing of the Socialist People's Party and number of trade unions. It advocates prompt measures to improve the workir people's condition, carry out an effective agrarian reform, nationalise the k industries and pass a new democratic electoral law.

PORTUGAL

The "Fifty Million Escudos" fund-raising campaign in support of t Portuguese Communist Party is making good headway. Launched in Februar

it had brought in 10 million escudos by early March. Within the framework of the campaign, a movement initiated by workers at the nationalised CUF industrial complex has been unfolding under the slogan "One day's work for the Party". Supporting the initiative, thousands of workers, many of whom do not belong to the PCP, contribute one day's earnings to the Party treasury. The CUF Communists' initiative, *Avante* comments, has become a factor for unity in the struggle against a comeback of fascism, in defence of the interests of all working people.

RUMANIA

As of December 31, 1976, the Rumanian Communist Party had more than 2,665,000 members, who made up 26.8 per cent of the economically active population. Engaged in the sphere of material production were 72.9 per cent of the Party members. Over 106,000 new members were admitted in 1976. Workers and peasants make up 83.5 per cent of them and the rest are professional and office employees. Women account for 33.7 per cent of the new members and for 25.8 per cent of the total membership.

SPAIN

A sustained and protracted struggle by the Communists and all Spanish democrats against fascism, for a deep-going democratisation of public life, has resulted in legalising the Communist Party of Spain. For almost forty years, it had to operate in strictly illegal conditions and in the face of brutal repression.

This major victory of the country's democratic forces fighting for a new, democratic Spain, against survivals of the Franco dictatorship, is also a result of powerful international solidarity.

Reliable Compass for the Communist Future

HORST DOHLUS

Alternate Political Bureau Member and Central Committee Secretary, SUPG

THE continued building of developed socialist society—the programme approved by the Ninth Party Congress—creates the basic requisites for the gradual transition to communism. This programme, which will cover several five-year periods. gives our people a clear perspective. Continuous, uninterrupted development has always been a characteristic feature of SUPG policy. The Central Committee report to the Ninth Congress, delivered by the Party's General Secretary, Erich Honecker, and other congress documents are expressive of our Party's supreme and invariable goal namely, the well-being of the working class and the people, their happiness in conditions of socialism and peace. In future, too, this will be the objective of all our efforts.

The results achieved to date show that the Party decisions are correct and that they are being systematically put into practice. Economic development continues at a steady and dynamic rate. We are successfully carrying out the most

ambitious social programme in the history of our people. The socialist wo
peasant state has become stronger still. The Party has formed even close
with the people. All these are essential conditions for the further advance o
socialist society. As an inseparable part of the socialist community united aro
the Soviet Union, the German Democratic Republic is contributing to w
socialism and to durable world peace.

Our constructive effort since the Ninth Congress has reaffirmed
accomplishment of the tasks set out in the programme is possible only thro
the conscious and active work of all Party members in accordance with
provisions of the Party Rules which, with the Programme, form an indivis
dialectical unity. Lenin emphasised: "Unity on questions of programme
tactics is an essential but by no means a sufficient condition for Party unity,
the centralisation of Party work.... The latter requires, in addition, unity
organisation which... is inconceivable without formal rules" (*Coll. Works,*
7, p. 387). Lenin's principle retains all its validity today.

The Party Rules approved by the Ninth Congress accord with the hig
demands stemming from the new stage of the GDR's social development
from its growing international responsibilities. The Rules should be seen
guidelines for the conscious and organised activity of all Party members
candidate members.

The Party's policy and practice fully conform with the laws of so
development and with the social trends of this age of transition from capital
to socialism on a world scale. The Programme and the Rules reaffirm that
Party is a reliable and inseparable part of the international Communist
workers' movement, a Party of proletarian internationalism.

Fraternal ties with the CPSU, that tested and most experienced Commu
Party which, with the victory of the Great October Socialist Revolution 60 ye
ago, was the first to bring the working class and labouring peasantry to pov
are for us a fundamental question, a question of our class positions. The attit
to the Soviet Union is the criterion of a revolutionary and internationalist.
in conformity with the Party Rules, members and candidate members of
SUPG are promoting friendship, co-operation and fraternal alliance with
USSR. They uphold the unity of all the countries of the socialist commun
assist the process of socialist economic integration, express their solidarity w
the working class of capitalist countries in its fight against imperialism, and w
all the peoples battling for national and social emancipation.

Reflected in the Programme and the Rules are the fundamental conclusions
have drawn from the experience of our Party and working class, nam
socialism in the GDR advances the more successfully, the closer national
international interests are intertwined, the more profound our understand
and application of the general laws of socialist revolution and socia
construction, the more we draw on the experience of Lenin's Party and of ot
fraternal parties.

Every passing day furnishes added proof that the changing internatio
balance of forces in favour of socialism and peace is a thorn in the flesh for
imperialists. The ideological struggle between socialism and imperialism
becoming increasingly complicated, more intense and wider in scope. Hence
Party effort to raise the level of our ideological and political work. And this, t
finds expression in the Party Rules, which bind members to wage

uncompromising struggle against all manifestations of anti-Communism and racism, expose the man-hating nature of imperialism, and resolutely rebuff all its attempts to interfere in the internal affairs of socialist and other countries.

The Rules emphasise the need to improve the quality of ideological work to meet the new, higher demands, improve Marxist-Leninist training and raise the qualifications of Party members and candidate members. This follows from the requirements both of our society and of the worldwide class struggle. Ideological work, now as always, is at the very heart of Party activity.

SUPG members have the right and duty constantly to heighten their socialist consciousness, master Marxist-Leninist theory and raise their political and professional qualifications so as always to be prepared to cope with the increasingly complex problems. Our Party has always devoted much attention to these matters. It has provided all the conditions necessary for study and has established appropriate institutes. Last year, for instance, 54,000 more Party members were involved in our study programmes. And in the period between the Eighth and Ninth Party congresses more than 340,000 Party members were able to improve their political training. Today about 94 per cent of Party branch secretaries at big factories and economic amalgamations have a higher or specialised secondary education. All this is in line with the Party Rules, which make it obligatory for all Party members to spread the Marxist-Leninist world outlook, constantly strengthen their ties with the masses, explain the meaning of Party policy and decisions, convince people of the correctness of that policy, mobilise them to put it into practice, and learn from the masses.

Socialist patriotism and proletarian internationalism form an inseparable unity in all our ideological work. This and the promotion of Marxism-Leninism have given all Party members and candidate members, our working class and the entire people a keen sense of proletarian internationalism. Party members make it their duty to cultivate in our people socialist consciousness, the principles of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism.

Our own experience, as generalised in the Party Programme and Rules, has prompted SUPG members fully to support the fundamental proposition contained in the CC CPSU resolution of January 31, 1977, on the 60th Anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution, namely, that proletarian internationalism is the crucial, tested principle of Communist activity. "The solidarity of the working class, of Communists in all countries in the struggle for common goals, their support for the struggle for national liberation and social progress, the voluntary co-operation among equal and independent fraternal Parties, the organic combination in their policy of the national and international interests of the working people—all this is proletarian internationalism in action. It has always been and remains a powerful and tested weapon of the communist and working class movement."

And employing that well-tried weapon against anti-Communist ideology and propaganda, preventing the imperialists from using anti-Communism and nationalism to dull that weapon, is a duty of all SUPG members set out in the Party Rules. It is a class duty which GDR Communists discharge with a feeling of great responsibility. This implies firm solidarity with peoples fighting imperialism, fascism and racism, and active support of progressive and revolutionary forces in every part of the world.

All the provisions of the Rules, all the obligations it imposes on Party

members, organisations and leading Party organs, fully accord with the supı law of our Party, namely, to work for the interests of the working class, foı benefit of the entire people.

These interests are served by the peace policy formulated at the Ninth P Congress. The Party Programme explicitly says that the SUPG will consiste work to preserve peace and promote international security, for world peace i: cardinal condition for the successful building of socialist and communist soc the preservation of peace concerns the whole of mankind. These principles l found concrete expression in the Party Rules, the preamble to which says tha Party leads the people on the road to socialism and communism, to peace democracy.

From this follows the duty of every Party member tirelessly to work for p and friendship among the peoples. The Rules call for energetic efforts by P members for international peace and security. This in turn calls for cons strengthening of the GDR and the socialist community, exposing and repel every imperialist attack on detente, strengthening the defence capacity of Republic, maintaining political vigilance and instilling in our people a keen s of responsibility.

The Party and the people are proud of the meaningful contribution they l made to the preservation of peace, and in future, too, as the Ninth Cong declared, every effort will be made to assure European and world peace. " implies," Comrade Honecker has emphasised, "a resolute rebuff to all attack our achievements, to all attempts to interfere in the internal affairs of sovereign German Democratic Republic."

Further improvement of material and cultural standards is a component of Party's policy of promoting the interests of the working people. That is purpose, *the main goal,* in building developed socialist society, and i facilitated by unity of our economic and social policy. That course was map out by the Eighth Party Congress and further elaborated in the decisions of Ninth Congress. To stress the political importance of this main goal and the g demands it makes on Party work, this goal has been formulated in the Rule follows: "A further rise in the material and cultural standards of the people or basis of high growth rates in socialist production, higher efficiency, scientific technological progress and growing labour productivity."

The ways and means of attaining that main goal are spelled out in the 197(five-year plan. It envisages a steady, dynamic growth of the economy as the b for accomplishing our major social and political tasks.

Activity by Party members, the example they set, their initiative, are deci factors in attaining our main goal. And we can safely say that heightened acti by Party branches and production teams is yielding good results. This is ad proof that the expansion of inner-Party democracy provided for by the R plays a big part in mobilising Party members and candidate members bot political affairs and in production. Party members now make wider use of rights granted them by the Rules. They have a bigger share in working concrete measures that help the attainment of our main goal and fulfilmen development plans. There is a frank and fruitful exchange of views at bra meetings. More use, and with a bigger sense of responsibility, is being made of right of Party branches to control the work of factory managements and staffs of government agencies. The development of inner-Party democı

encourages Party members to make full use of their rights and, by their conscious and voluntary discipline, set an example of a socialist attitude to one's work, propose innovations, popularise new work methods, show concern for fellow-workers and carry out their public functions in an exemplary manner.

The annual and five-year economic development plans are more and more becoming a programme for all Party branches and for the working people generally. Socialist competition is providing more scope for initiative, efficient production methods and accelerated scientific and technological progress. The results can be seen in the fulfilment of the economic plan for 1976, the opening year of the current five-year programme. Industrial output rose by 5.9 per cent and labour productivity by 6 per cent. The commissioning of 150,617 new or modernised flats (of which 103,091 are in new buildings) has meant better housing conditions for 450,000 people.

Our citizens know and appreciate that we are making this progress against a background of crisis and a bleak outlook for the future in capitalist countries. Party members are fully conscious of the fact that our uninterrupted progress rests, as the Party Programme emphasises, on our socialist system, on the political power of the working class, which, led by the Marxist-Leninist Party and in alliance with the co-operative farmers, the intelligentsia and other working strata, upholds the interests of the entire people. The firm economic foundation of this system is socialist ownership of the means of production. Government by the workers and peasants in alliance with other sections of the working people has, for the first time in the history of our nation, guaranteed all human rights. Socialism and freedom are inseparable without socialism there can be no freedom, without freedom there can be no socialism.

The Marxist-Leninist classics considered the restructuring of production relations through establishment of public ownership of the basic means of production to be the central question of the transition from capitalism to socialism. And to make this transition possible, they emphasised, the working class must establish its political power, the dictatorship of the proletariat.[1] This main question has been resolved in the socialist countries, and they are making steady progress. The apologists for imperialism, despite all their hatred of socialist freedoms and democracy, are powerless to halt this progress.

Fulfilment of the Programme and other decisions of the Ninth Party Congress makes greater demands on our Marxist-Leninist Party. The Party Rules take full account of that, but at the same time they are a reflection of the growing maturity of our Party, of its continuous development, especially since the Eighth Party Congress. The Rules provide the Party with the organisational instrument for attaining its main goals.

The Rules take into account the greater role of the Marxist-Leninist Party as the conscious and organised vanguard of the working class and other working people of our Republic. The SUPG is the supreme form of social and political organisation of the working class, its tested vanguard, and it operates as the leading force of socialist society, of all the organisations, both state and public, of the working class and the working people generally. It unites in its ranks the most advanced part of the working class, co-operative farmers, intelligentsia and other working people.

The SUPG now has 2,074,799 members and candidate members. Party membership entails many obligations. Party members must live up to the proud

name of Communist. That too is laid down in the Rules, which define who can be *a Party member, and his rights and duties.*

Membership in the Socialist Unity Party of Germany is open to all working people who accept its Programme and Rules, take an active part in building developed socialist society in the GDR, participate in the work of a Party organisation, fulfil the decisions of the Party and regularly pay membership dues.

We attach great importance to admitting new members and strengthening the Party's class basis, for only a Party rooted in its class can impart to the revolutionary working class the ability and determination needed to discharge its historic mission of building the new society.

Our Party does have its roots in the working class—74.5 per cent of its members and candidate members come from the working class, and about 56 per cent are industrial workers, 5 per cent co-operative farmers, 20.6 per cent intellectuals, 11.3 per cent white-collar workers, and 7.1 per cent come from other categories. Last year, 57,830 front-rank workers, among them a large number of young skilled workers, were admitted to the Party. The figures are evidence of the Party's prestige in the working class, of its close links with the masses and the magnetism of the Ninth Congress decisions.

The Party Rules accord with the principles of democratic centralism and with the Leninist standards of Party life. The Rules emphasise: "The Party sees to the strict observance of democratic centralism and the Leninism standards of Party life, its collective leadership and inner-Party democracy." All Party organs from top to bottom are democratically elected and regularly report back to the membership. Strict Party discipline, unfailing fulfilment of Party decisions and broad inner-Party democracy are all part of democratic centralism.

Inner-Party democracy, based on democratic centralism, assures every Party member the right openly to state his views on the Party's policy and the way its decisions are carried out. And the Party sees to it that the activity and creative initiative of all its members are given full scope and that criticism and self-criticism are encouraged.

The Ninth Party Congress substantially amended the section of the Rules on obligations and rights of Party members. This was done because, with the growing role of the Party, greater demands are made on all of its members. Attainment of the Party's goals now depends in decisive measure on the moral and political qualities of its members, their principled stand, their militancy, their ability to serve as an example for others. The Rules bind every Party member actively and consciously, in an organised and disciplined manner, to share in all the work of the Party, in framing and carrying out its decisions, and in controlling their fulfilment.

Developments since the Ninth Congress have made it clear that the Party is now stronger, enjoys higher prestige, is more closely linked with the masses. The Party Rules have visibly activised this process.

Leading Party bodies and Party branches are doing much more to develop inner-Party life, to assure wider discussion of problems, provide Party members and candidate members with more detailed and comprehensive information, giving them more effective arguments for their propaganda, setting more specific Party asignments and organising verification of their fulfilment. More and more Party branches are arranging their work so that every Party member can fulfil his

ıssignment from class positions, in a disciplined manner, with a sense of esponsibility and with the knowledge that he has the full backing of the Party ollective.

Meetings of our Party branches and sub-branches, of which there are more han 74,000, play a big part here. The meetings are held regularly, as prescribed y the Party Rules, and are well attended. For instance, the meetings that were ıeld during the campaign for fulfilling the Congress decisions became more lown-to-earth. The Central Committee has urged Party branches to hold their neetings in a more creative atmosphere, make the reports more interesting, more ttuned to reality, promote a frank exchange of views and encourage onstructive criticism and self-criticism.

The Party Programme and Rules call for further development of the activity of 'arty branches and leading Party organs in order to meet growing requirements nd demands. The Ninth Party Congress emphasised that we must always bear in nind the growing importance of ideological and political work, that Communists must always and everywhere be in the front ranks in carrying out 'arty policy, and that the Party must achieve a higher standard of omprehensive leadership of the social processes taking place in our Republic. 'his means we must always reckon with the complexity and interdependence of ocial problems and combine our day-to-day work with our long-range goals. 'his, in turn, requires a higher standard of collective leadership, which does not, owever, preclude full personal responsibility.

Unswerving observance of the Party Rules, the activity of every Party unctionary and every Party member in conformity with this basic law of the 'arty is the key to successful fulfilment of all the tasks now confronting the Communists.

[1] Cf. F. Engels, "Anti-Duhring", Part III, Chapter II.

Lessons of Chile
*Article 5**

Defending the People's Power

PEDRO RODRIGUEZ
Member of the National Leadership, Communist Party of Chile

HE events that took place in Chile and all that befell the Salvador Allende overnment impel one to seek a deeper understanding of that key question of all evolutions, the question of power, and more particularly, how to defend and naintain power. The character of the historical and political conditions under which our experience of revolutionary governing (with all its achievements and nistakes) was shaped, must be discerned and correctly interpreted because such nowledge is the key to learning how to deal with this problem. With us this was a juestion of the emergence at government level of the sector of revolutionary eople's. power as a result of the winning of a corresponding *part of the*

* See *WMR*, January, February, March and May, 1977.

government apparatus. It was a question of this sector's ability to *combine* i
own work with the revolutionary drive of the masses, to guide them towar
accomplishing revolutionary-democratic tasks, towards socialism.

In one or another degree the Chilean events reflect practically all the problem
of Marxist-Leninist theory of revolution, of capturing and retaining power: th
dialectics of using the material power of government and democracy, of peopl
democratic tasks and socialist goals, of the objective and subjecti
revolutionary factors, of national features and general laws, of the national an
the international, and so on. In short, all those questions that require th
unflagging attention of Communists and revolutionaries.

A Few General Comments

Our revolutionary experience shows that the laws governing the transitio
from an old society to a new one function irrespective of the path this transitio
takes. Transformation of the old state, while not an automatic process,
inevitable even though at a given stage there may be evolutionary continuity c
the form of rule, i.e., preservation for a time of the old form but with new conten

When the working class and its allies have control of a certain sector of powe
particularly if executive power has been attained, as was the case in Chile, it
something of a paradox. In Chile the popular movement was able to concentra
its class forces *with the aid* (!) of the old government machinery. Obviousl
however, for this new centralising force to become effective and capable c
channelling events *in a desired direction* new methods and a new governme
machine were required.

Because the proletariat is in the lead it cannot stop half-way and postpon
accomplishment of this task, it must extend its class influence, the influence c
the popular movement to the entire government apparatus, whose natur
function is to execute and defend its power, and to control it. Otherwise, th
popular forces will not be free to carry out effective revolutionar
transformations. In Chile, with only the government to support it, the popula
movement was bound by bourgeois power extending through all the remainin
organs of state. The majority of these were in bourgeois hands (legislative an
judiciary power, administrative and juridical organs and their stronge
levers—the armed forces and the media). Events were to show ou
underestimation of the fact that from the very outset the monopolies an
imperialism were at a disadvantage, even in danger, because they could no longe
rely on the outdated bourgeois-democratic institutions and classical politica
methods to restrain the growing popular movement, which had a revolutionar
programme and was determined to carry it out. It was the local big bourgeoisi
and imperialism who were forced to discard the *old form* of rule because it n
longer served their class strategy.

Creation of the Popular Unity government was the popular movement'
foremost achievement. Mass activity was bound up with this government, it
functioning and its protection, and the urgent revolutionary transformatio
that it planned. The government was the deciding factor in developing th
revolutionary situation and creating the socio-political conditions for clarifyin
the question of people's rule. The popular government was the force behind th
cardinal economic reforms, effective development of democracy, broadening th
popular alliance and fostering the organisation and revolutionary consciousnes
of the people.

The dynamic struggle of the proletariat and the popular government for revolutionary transformations, on the one hand, and, on the other, the bourgeois and imperialist resistance to the revolution and determination to restore the regime at all costs made it imperative for the sector of state power that had been won to be extended and transformed into a new type of democratic popular state. Under these conditions retention of power and defence of revolutionary gains required not just a status quo, but continuation of the revolutionary process *consolidation of people's power and presupposed specific steps in that direction.*

Progress is possible only from one phase to another. In our revolution these are, first, the phase where the working class and its allies, after winning a part of state power, begin to function in the state apparatus and set up a government. Second, the phase where the popular government is in power, does not break with those institutions of the state apparatus that are still in the hands of the big bourgeoisie, and functions within the framework of the bourgeois-democratic constitution. This is the phase of initial democratic transformations when, against the background of a general upsurge of the mass struggle and the temporary shock of the reactionary forces, the socio-political situation permits the use of the constitutional methods that brought such a situation into being. The third phase, which was particularly acute and explosive in Chile, is the phase of mounting clashes and conflicts between the organs of state power in reactionary hands, and those organs of state power belonging to the people. In this phase the clash between these two opposing poles, actually two dictatorships (with dictatorship of the popular movement still in its embryonic stage) reveals a growing tendency to "break out" of the sphere of state institutions. At a certain point the popular movement, for the sake of self-preservation and to complete its transformations, itself started becoming a kind of centre of the state activities of the revolutionary masses, i.e., "a power directly based on revolutionary seizure, on the direct initiative of the people from below, and *not on a law* enacted by a centralised state power" (Lenin, *Coll. Works,* Vol. 24, p. 38).

Now it is apparent that this should be followed by a phase where people's power aims at building a new democratic state by combining its own state activity with the activities of the broad masses of working people, the majority of the population. The last two phases could be separated by months, or by hours, in which case the goals of both phases would have to be attained almost simultaneously. The experience of Popular Unity shows that it failed to cope with this set of problems. "*Speaking concretely*", said our comrades through the Information Bulletin of the Chilean Solidarity Committee in Havana (August 1974, No. 97), "*in this case the enemy did his work while we did not do ours*".

Our analysis showed that all these phases, each of which is characterised by its political content, specific balance of forces and an equally specific development level of a ripening revolutionary situation, could have happened in Chile already in the first half of 1971. This was the time of an unprecedented increase in the mass struggle, a time when objective conditions made it difficult for imperialism and the big national bourgeoisie to unite and openly oppose the revolution, when the greater part of the middle strata leaned towards the popular government and the balance of forces in Latin America was very favourable to developing democracy and social progress in Chile.

There were many more similarly appropriate situations—the strike in October 1972, the "tankazo" (uprising in the tank units) in June 1973, and so on.

However, each situation was progressively more explosive and in a sense this
endangering the revolutionary cause. From all this we have concluded th
vanguard party must be able to foresee those crucial minutes when the succe
the revolution, as our Vietnamese comrades say, resembles a ton hanging
hair. The party should see these minutes before the popular movement ta
possession of a part of state power; it must be able to use the opportunity w
the enemy is weakest and needs time to gather its forces that have b
temporarily paralysed as a result of the people's victories, and when inte
dissension prevents it from uniting in a counter-revolutionary front and plan
its actions. In other words, the Party must be able to determine the "... *turn*
point in the history of the growing revolution when the activity of the advan
ranks of the people is at its height, and when the *vacillations* in the ranks of
enemy and *in the ranks of the weak, half-hearted and irresolute friends of*
revolution are strongest" (Lenin, *Coll. Works*, Vol. 26, pp. 22-23). Only s
continuity will make it possible to retain captured positions, ensure power for
alliance of progressive forces and to enter the phase clearly defined by Leni
the period of transition to socialism.

We have learned that the strategy of power must be built on consideratio
the tasks of the revolutionary movement as a whole, the need to deal with th
simultaneously and to direct the masses' main blow against the old society's b
and superstructure. This is the only approach to the exercise of power that
ensure success in settling the problems of the economy and democracy.

The Programme of the Communist Party of Chile gives a scientific definit
of the concept of the revolution: "We view the Chilean revolution as a movem
of the working class and organised population which, by means of the m
struggle, removes the present ruling classes from power, liquidates the old st
apparatus and production relations obstructing development of the product
forces, and carries out profound transformations in the country's econon
social and political structure, opening the way to socialism."

"Reefs" of a Revolutionary Situation

From the viewpoint of revolutionary dynamics, the necessity of smo
transition from one phase to another and the complete triumph of Popular Un
policy, it was important for the popular struggle to steadily progress and, at
proper time, become nationwide. It was just as important that the peopl
power, as embodied in the Popular Unity government, should combine its w
with the political movement of the social majority, which was fully aware of
need for revolutionary transformations, and that it should be supported by t
majority. This is made possible only by a national revolutionary crisis emergi
on the basis of a maturing revolutionary situation.

In examining the problem of holding power and preparing conditions
taking over complete power we were convinced of the depth and timeliness
Lenin's concept of the revolution that it is the Communist Party which m
show itself to be the main creative force, a force capable of guiding the masses
the developing revolutionary situation. Of course, the revolutionary situation
in a sense, the sum total primarily of the objective changes in society. But r
every revolutionary situation leads to revolution, wrote Lenin. It only becom
such a situation when subjective activity is added to objective factors.
revolutionary forces must use the revolutionary situation. "What we a

discussing," Lenin wrote, "is the indisputable and fundamental duty of all socialists—*that of revealing to the masses the existence of a revolutionary* situation, explaining its scope and depth, arousing the proletariat's revolutionary consciousness and revolutionary determination, helping it to go over to revolutionary action, and forming, for that purpose, organisations suited to the revolutionary situation" (*Coll. Works*, Vol. 21, pp. 216-217).

At its 10th Congress in 1956 the Communist Party of Chile pointed out that there was a real possibility of gaining power and it is to the credit of General Secretary Luis Corvalan that he guided the Party and the revolutionary movement in that direction. Although the Party was relatively small in numbers in the early 1960s, this enabled it to win the support of the majority of working people and all the Left forces for the Programme, strategy and tactics that laid the foundations for the popular victory in 1970. This is an incontestable achievement and contribution by our Party to the Chilean revolution. The intrinsic logic and purpose of the propositions of the Popular Unity Programme embodying our political line and its conscious application in those conditions helped the popular government acquire its own distinctive features and bring into sharp focus its first and most important revolutionary measures. However, because we failed to see the significance of the ensuing processes, their relation to the revolutionary situation and its becoming a national crisis, and because certain forms of struggle were absolutised and we were poorly prepared for possible alternatives, our line was narrowed down, the popular forces' chances of retaining and consolidating their sector of government reduced, and conditions were not created for the people to gain full power.

Retaining Power and the Problem of the Use of Force

From the viewpoint of social content all revolutions involve the use of force. The theory on the state evolved by Marx and Engels and elaborated by Lenin is confirmation of this. Lenin called Engels' theory of the state "a veritable panegyric on violent revolution" (*Coll. Works*, Vol. 25, p. 399), and stressed that Marxism's goal was to educate the broad masses in the spirit of such a revolution.

An obsolete class will never relinquish its power voluntarily without sooner or later putting up the fiercest resistance all along the line. But neither can the revolutionary proletariat be stopped once it has started the revolution. Such is the effect of this inexorable law of history, and it has been confirmed by the events in Chile.

Essentially, social coercion is nothing but a struggle between opposing, antagonistic forces, and is expressed in various forms of class struggle. So any of them, even the most peaceful, is always *essentially* coercive. These truths are also confirmed by the events in Chile, and were stressed in the preceding articles in this series.

On the basis of such a broad approach, the efforts by Communists and all revolutionaries to create conditions for a favourable balance in the armed forces, acquire prime importance. This is a question of strategy. Whether or not this balance will emerge at a definite time in the *form* of an armed conflict between classes depends on conditions and tactics. Consequently, retaining the part of state power that has been won, developing it and advancing towards socialism without a civil war presupposes a good deal of flexibility. This is not only because of the natural instability in the situation. A balance that will prevent reaction

from launching an armed struggle against the popular government must |
achieved in all sectors.

Chile's experience confirms the *possibility* of *gaining partial state* power ar establishing and retaining a government before a balance in the armed forc favourable to the revolution is achieved. However, in the final analysis tl experience of the Popular Unity government has shown that it is possible ı *retain* and broaden this partially gained power only if the mass struggle and tl general revolutionary crisis will create the requisite balance, and this depends n only on the objective disunity of bourgeois forces. To a very great extent depends on the effective work of revolutionaries.

Economic Policy

An interesting phenomenon was observed in Chile—at a certain stage in tl struggle during the period of Popular Unity government, the opposing classe well aware that their historical interests were at stake (no matter whether th were of an objective nature or were ideological illusions[1]) rose above the immediate economic interests.

Retaining power required energetic explanatory and ideological work to mal the population fully conscious of the historical significance of the revolution ar its economic achievements. As we realised, effort should have been kept up un the people themselves became convinced that the revolutionary econom achievements were well established and that Popular Unity had taken over tl levers of government from reaction. At the same time attention should have bee concentrated on economic changes in the people's interests. These are a important factor in stimulating consistent effort. They testify to tl government's readiness to carry out its promises. They likewise consolidate an further the popular alliance and help isolate the opponents of social progress

The economic situation in which the Popular Unity government was forced ı deal with these problems was unusually complicated. The financial and lande oligarchy was still a great influence in the economy and controlled massi financial resources, a considerable part of which was intended for speculatio Many economic levers were still in its hands and it retained influence in tł government bureaucracy. The parliamentary opposition majority made difficult, at times impossible, to pass laws that could rectify the situation. For th reason crimes of an economic nature were not legally punishable. It was als imperative to restructure the whole relationship of foreign economi dependence. This meant not only returning to Chile control of its basic resource which were in the hands of the US monopolies, but also liquidating thes monopolies' domination of the economy, particularly its most dynami branches, changing the historically shaped geographic structure of foreign trad establishing new international financial relations, and effecting other measure And it was in these difficult conditions that the profound transformation envisaged in the government programme had to be carried out, the publi economic sector developed, production increased, labour productivity raisec *the basic principles of planning and centralised management formulated,* and th masses, particularly the working people, involved in genuine econom management.

In Chile imperialism did its utmost to destabilise the popular governmen Economically it resorted to a financial and technological blockade. With the hel

of Chile's financial clans it mounted desperate opposition inside the country, ooycotting production, leaking currency abroad and speculating in capital. To his the imperialists and reactionaries added psychological warfare[2] to intimidate he population, particularly the middle strata, create a black market, cause a hortage of consumer goods and food, and general economic chaos and anarchy. The imperialists and reactionaries were bent on preventing any balance of forces eing established that would in any way be favourable to the popular government, and on isolating the latter. Imperialist strategists were fully aware of he economic and political importance of that part of the population connected vith retail trade and transport and were counting on their being able to paralyse he economy and, as a result of economic manipulations by the monopolies, turn large part of the population against the government.

The Chilean events have taught the Communists the need to foresee inevitable conomic problems and find ways of settling them, the need for sustained deological work on these problems and explaining to the masses that at such imes they must put duty before rights and be prepared to make certain material acrifices for the revolution, so that together with the revolution they can finally vercome backwardness and exploitation. Ideological work must be correctly roportioned with practical activities for the revolutionary goals. The activities f the masses and government action must be organised so as to prevent lisruption of the economy. Communists must demonstrate their ability to deal vith economic problems with the help of their allies, the popular masses, the ocialist countries and international solidarity, and of course, above all, by their wn handling of the economy.

Yet another lesson we have learned is that the ability of the Communists and heir allies to defend and consolidate people's power, to find a correct solution or economic problems depends in large measure on how realistic and viable the conomic programme itself is, how clearly the Communists visualise the stages of he revolution, the scope and depth of the socio-economic problems at every tage and the general rate at which transformations should be made. Revolutions annot be tied down to any particular date. The rate at which changes take place annot be determined by revolutionaries at will. It is determined by the actual onditions, internal and external, and these the revolutionaries must foresee.

Democracy and Its Class Character

The Salvador Allende government was the most democratic in Chile's history. t was supported by the overwhelming majority of the population, was closely ound up with their difficult struggle and was a reflection of the Chilean people's ervent desire for change. This government developed the people's democratic ains, improving their content; it gave the people a larger role in running the ountry and was deeply patriotic.

The popular government granted full freedom of self-expression to all sections f society. This fact is particularly important in connection with the current in-epth discussions of democracy, its class character and content. The ideological nd practical activities of the popular government were centred mainly on the roblem of democracy and developing the positive values and institutions that he working people had won. At the same time, it became apparent that nperialism's attitude towards freedom and democracy, and its initial acceptance" of the people's decisions and intentions, were pure hypocrisy. For

example, when the popular government was formed after the general election, the classes that were hostile to the revolutionary process, showing that they were following the "rules of the game", did not openly sabotage its work. It is an undeniable fact, however, that imperialism was preparing its conspiracy before the Popular Unity government came to power.

During the initial stage of the revolution the nature of democracy and freedom, their *class essence* were hidden in the shell of the prevailing legal forms, which obscured the level and content of the class struggle. At the beginning these forms restricted its development to such an extent that the popular movement was compelled to partially accept the bourgeois rules of playing democracy under which it was developing. It had to do this to demonstrate the legality of its government in the eyes of a part of society and the army. This government, however, did immediately take advantage of the existing institutions to carry out several basic transformations in the people's interests.

At the beginning this situation forced the big bourgeoisie and imperialism to express formal recognition of the popular government but did not stop them from using the institutions of state power to set up obstacles and interfere with its work.

Nevertheless, this relatively favourable balance during the first stages helped the popular government because it made way for its initiative when the time came for the more important transformations. But this balance shifted when the bourgeoisie started opposing the revolutionary changes and to come to an open confrontation of hostile forces. This confrontation, at first legally regulated by the ruling classes, turned into a clash that was not regulated by any of the existing laws. It has been shown that this struggle continues until either the new democratic development determined by the popular forces establishes a new social order or, as was the case in Chile, fascism seizes power, abolishes all democracy and launches outright terror on behalf of the big national and imperialist financial capital against *all* other classes, and all "plays" by the class forces comes to an end. Fascism, said Georgi Dmitrov, means settling accounts with the working class by terror when its state and economic regime can no longer compete with the working class even by playing with marked cards at the bourgeois game of democracy.

The experience of our revolution has made it quite plain to us that from the point of view of retaining power and defending the revolution, the problems connected with the new scope and new essence of democracy and also the weight and strength of the new power and its state organs are of decisive importance. "As for the development of society," said Luis Corvalan, addressing a meeting in Moscow in 1977, "our position is clear. In a society that consists of antagonistic classes all forms of rule represent an aspect of dictatorship of the ruling class, and dictatorship of the proletariat is more democratic than any form of bourgeois rule. International experience attests to this. In the light of what took place in Chile, it is imperative today to bring a popular government to power that is capable of countering all the conspiracies and coups planned by imperialism, internal reaction and fascism. The question of a dictatorship of the proletariat is not on the agenda in Chile today, but at the appropriate time it will inevitably arise, making the democratic gains more effective."

Progress towards socialism without an armed class struggle presupposes wide and vigorous polarisation of social forces. Naturally, those forces opposed to the

ṛvolution place themselves objectively outside the values of real democracy; ther forces are not part of the revolutionary camp although they remain within ıe framework of this democracy. The popular movement carries on a political nd ıdeological struggle to win over new forces, to defend revolutionary goals, ıd to launch political and philosophical discussions within the concepts of the ɛw society. Relations with these forces and their parties, like the political and leological struggle, may be expressed in various ways that include co-operation ased on unity and a comparison of differences. But one thing, the main thing, is 'ear: *democracy must serve the people and not allow freedom of action for the ɔunter-revolutionary forces.* This is, life has taught us, one of the absolute ɔnditions for defending revolutionary gains.

The experience of the popular government is further confirmation of the fact ıat the struggle can take a correct revolutionary course and assume a mass scale nly ıf the working class maintains its leading role and class independence. We ave learned that the need for a broad front cannot be replaced by a "pluralistic" ɔproach that forfeits or weakens the leading role of the working class. The orking class and its party must wage an ideological struggle against anarchism, ıventurism and Right-wing opportunism, which seeks a way out of the tuation through agreement with reaction. All this places a big responsibility on ıe Communist Party and its allies and shows the need to make a theoretical ımming up of the experience of other revolutions, but above all the lessons of ır own people's struggle. The Party must identify their creative potentials and arn from the experience of our allies in struggle.

[1] The latter were characteristic of certain in-between social strata that were won over by reaction though they enjoyed economic advantages from the Popular Unity government.
[2] See Rodrigo Rojas, "Psychological Warfare: a Political Weapon of Imperialism", *WMR*, March '77

Communists Propose a Solution

Two Interviews on Party Work in the Economic Field

With the capitalist world shaken by economic crisis, Communists naturally pay closer attention to the economic aspect of Party activity, to the problem of an alternative to bourgeois economic policy. Communist experience in capitalist countries has been discussed in previous issues.[1] Here representatives of two fraternal parties on the journal reply to the following questions from the Commission for the Exchange of Experience in Party Work:

What significance does your Party attach to working out an alternative to bourgeois economic policy?

What are the main lines of the Party's work in the economic field?

Who organises it?

ETTY SINCLAIR, Member of the National Executive Committee, ommunist Party of Ireland:

Our Party deals at great length with the economic problems facing the whole

country. And understandably so for Ireland is in the throes of a deep economic crisis. Its causes are many and varied but, undoubtedly, it stems from the dependence of the Irish economy on international, primarily British, capital

It is common knowledge that there are two states in Ireland, i.e., that controlled by the Dublin government (at present a coalition government of Fine Gael and Labour) and Northern Ireland which has been under the direct control of the London government since March 1972. Both parts of the country are included in the framework of the EEC. In addition to this, the Dublin government, in 1970, agreed to the Anglo-Irish Free Trade Agreement which required that government to take steps to liquidate all tariff barriers that had been erected to aid Irish industry. The "partnership" of British and Irish industry has had significant results for Irish industry in that its market is totally open to the more developed and sophisticated industrial structures of Britain and cannot compete with the giant British monopolies. This has caused the closure of a number of industries, i.e., boot and shoe, clothing, etc.

In *Northern Ireland* some 80 per cent of all industry is controlled from Britain, aided by multinationals from France, West Germany, Denmark, the USA, etc. There is an old saying to the effect that "when the British economy gets a cold, Northern Ireland suffers from pneumonia". The British economy has been suffering more than an ordinary cold since 1974 and the Northern Ireland economy is being ravaged.

About 50 per cent of the equity of the *Irish Republic's* banking system is in foreign ownership, primarily British but also American. Foreign multinationals have also taken over commanding positions in all fields of commerce. Since it was elected in 1973 the Dublin government's borrowings have been of the order of almost £1,500 million, that is, public borrowing has been some £130,000 million more than that of successive Dublin governments in all the years between 1922 (when the state was set up) and 1973.

In both parts of the country, unemployment is rife. Crisis phenomena are also typical of farming. The size of cultivated land has decreased and the small farmowners are being ruined.

Governments, North and South, have relied upon the encouragement of multinationals, from Britain and elsewhere, to set up branch factories with the aid of public funds and tax and rates exemptions. Such inducements, in the present economic crisis of capitalism, are no longer bringing the desired results. In Northern Ireland no new investment from outside (or local) sources has been forthcoming for the past two years. The "safety valve" for the Irish bourgeoisie and those who maintain the link with Britain in Northern Ireland, i.e., emigration, is no longer operative in the old way as each country of capitalism faces its own growing unemployment problem.

The 16th Congress of the CPI (1975) called for a "Counter-Crisis Campaign" with the following demands:

1. Tariff protection for threatened industries.

2. A programme of job expansion by state control of banks, insurance societies and other financial institutions, thus ensuring the necessary flow of credit and the prevention of the export of capital which should be retained for industrial development. Such state control to be the first step to state ownership of the above.

3. The setting up of state industries.

4. State development of the mineral, oil, gas and other natural resources.

5. A breakout from its present trading areas with a completely new orientated attitude of extensive relations with all socialist countries.

The 16th Congress emphasised that the economic crisis was not a "world wide one" as had been claimed by the capitalist class in Ireland, and stated that the "socialist third of the world is not only unaffected but is developing and expanding in all sectors" (Political Resolution). The Congress called for co-operation with the socialist countries, on mutually advantageous terms.

Demands affecting the *North of Ireland* called for bringing of the Belfast Shipyard under Northern Ireland public ownership and control in order to ensure its future; that the Westminster Government provide the power and capital to establish publicly-owned industries under local control; that fiscal powers would be held by any future Northern Ireland administration, including control over the import and export of goods and capital; that Britain's huge arms bill of more than £6,500 million be drastically cut and money be spent on development of public industries, housing, health and education in England, Wales, Scotland and Northern Ireland.

The Resolution pointed out: "The existence of the two state structures in Ireland does not invalidate an All-Ireland Counter-Crisis Campaign but in fact makes it necessary in order to change the system of private enterprise which is the basis for monopoly capitalist rule in the whole of the island." The common demands, North and South, were stated to be many: the redistribution of land with a view to government assisted large-scale co-operative farms; new tax structures to shift the tax burden from the working people to the wealthy, the abolition of the Value Added Tax (VAT) and the introduction of food subsidies and strict price control; elimination of the middleman by the setting up of Farm Producers—Town Consumers Markets and Co-operatives; nationalisation of all urban land for much needed emergency housing programmes; rejection of "social contracts" in the North and wage restraint in the South; the expansion of the economy by the raising of real wages, pensions and social benefits; the building of the home market which is at present saturated with foreign goods whilst official policy is concentrated in winning markets abroad and the common demand, North and South, *to get out of the Common Market.*

The correctness of the programme laid down by the 16th Congress has been vindicated by events, and steps have been taken in the Republic to create the "Left Alternative" to the economic crisis, which embraces the Communist Party of Ireland, the Republican Movement and the Labour Liaison of the Left, i.e., Left-wing members of the Irish Labour Party. The programme of the Left Alternative was launched at an overflow meeting in Dublin's Mansion House addressed by representatives of the three organisations and deals with the direction of economic policy, the building and construction industry, state companies, mineral resources and public ownership of the banking system. We are working actively to translate this programme into a reality. The three organisations have established a Study Group which is preparing a detailed study, industry by industry, of the causes of the present economic collapse and which will put forward a clear alternative in each industry.

The programme of the Left Alternative is gaining support throughout the Republic and not least among politically-motivated young people in the universities, who are assisting in the studies to be drawn up and in organisational

work. The Communists take part in other important campaigns in defence of working people's interests, in public meetings at Employment Exchanges and publicity within the trade union branches. As we are doing this, we constantly explain our ultimate aims to the masses, persuading them that there can be no radical solution of economic problems without advancing to socialism.

ALVARO MOSQUERA, Member of the Central Committee, Communist Party of Colombia:

Within the framework of our ideological and political activities we have lately been concentrating on economic studies. This is understandable, for the crisis has affected all spheres of society and what Marx said about looking for the anatomy of civil society in political economy is valid today as never before. We think it important to follow Lenin's advice regarding method: "... Theoretical work must be directed towards *the concrete study of all the forms of economic antagonism* ... it must *reveal this antagonism wherever it has been concealed by political history, by the peculiarities of legal systems or by established theoretical prejudice.* It must *present an integral picture of our realities as a definite system of production relations, show that the exploitation and expropriation of the working people are essential under this system, and show the way out of this system that is indicated by economic development*" (Lenin, *Coll. Works,* Vol. 1, p. 296).

This is the direction our Marxist publications and researchers associated with them try to follow. In the 122 issues of our Central Committee's journal *Documentos Politicos* that have been published in the past 20 years, no less than 120 authors have written on vital economic issues. Every issue of the journal *Estudios Marxistas* has included at least one substantial economics article. The Party paper *Voz Proletaria* carries a weekly "Economic Panorama" column and the *Boletin de Economia* is wholly devoted to the subject. Our publication *Cuadernos Politicos* devotes special issues to economic problems.

General economic problems and the economy of Colombia in particular are "musts" on the programme of the National Party Cadres School.

Although in one form or another all the Party's ideological work is connected with economics—for example the History of the Trade Union Struggle in Colombia by Edgar Caisedo—the following works by Party members on economic subjects deserve special mention: "The Land Problem in Colombia" by Anteo Quimbaya, "Lenin and Imperialism in Colombia" by Teodosio Varela, and "Polemics on Modern History" by Nicolas Buenaventura.

Economic studies are carried out by research groups, individual authors or members of the CC Executive Committee who are instructed to draw up reports and other Party documents, or by persons from the National Commission for Educating Communists. The Marxist publications of fraternal parties, including articles from the *World Marxist Review,* are of great help in this work.

In addition to its scientific aims, this work is intended to provide the Party and mass organisations with an effective weapon in the class struggle.

The Party's economic activities cover a wide range of international and particularly national problems. The three main fields are: problems of imperialist domination, the agrarian question, and problems of capitalist development.

The Party's position on these issues is most fully defined in its Programme. In all modesty we can say that the Programme of the CP Colombia is the result of a

deep-going Marxist-Leninist analysis of national affairs, primarily from the economic viewpoint.

The struggle against imperialist domination *"is the main question in Colombia's economic and political life"*, said our Party's General Secretary Gilberto Vieira. "This is the heart of our present struggle affecting all aspects of our national life: the recovery of our wealth, particularly oil, which means immediate nationalisation; economic independence; removing the burden of foreign debts and financial dependence; changing our US State Department-dominated foreign policy; evacuating the many military and pseudo-technical missions that have taken over government agencies at all levels; freeing education policy from imperialist tutelage and penetration, etc."

Imperialism, especially US imperialism, has lately been striving to establish control of the country's key industries, thus becoming an internal factor in Colombia's capitalist development. This new quality of imperialist penetration has serious economic, social and political consequences and breeds many new contradictions. On the one hand, it strengthens the big bourgeoisie's conciliatory positions and, on the other, it causes clashes between certain sectors of the economy and foreign capital. Party members have warned in their writings that imperialism's penetration of national industry carries the danger of foreign monopolies taking advantage of the home market, makes the settlement of contradictions between the people and the monopolies more complex, gives rise to new forms of imperialist domination, lends new meaning to certain "nationalistic" bourgeois slogans and *"creates a new range of class relations, imparts new content to the concept of industrialisation, reveals the essence of the more typical monopoly groups, and brings the class struggle closer into line with the demands for national emancipation."*

Imperialist capital investments are robbing the country of its natural resources—gold, silver, platinum, coal, nickel, gas and, particularly oil, the export of which does not give Colombia a penny. Moreover, imperialism has artificially caused an oil crisis in the country, and turned Colombia from an exporter into an importer of crude oil.

As for the new forms of imperialist domination, it is important to stress the role of thé ever larger government loans, which today exceed direct private capital investment. The result is that the foreign debt has doubled in the last five years. The imperialists are literally robbing the national budget of its life blood. The conciliatory bourgeois government and its financial nucleus are placing their hopes primarily on these loans, which allow imperialism to maintain a firm grip on such economic levers as wages policy, taxes and tariffs, currency exchange, export and agriculture.

To these forms of domination one must add the imperialist monopoly in foreign trade, which leads to non-equivalent exchange. This is worsened by the fact that the country's only important export commodity is coffee.

The agrarian problems can be narrowed down to the following: agriculture is dominated by semi-feudal relations best seen in the latifundium system; pre-capitalist forms are interlaced with new forms brought in by imperialist penetration and the slow development of capitalism in agriculture on the "Prussian" model. This is an obstacle to the formation of an agrarian working class and one reason for the mass exodus of landless peasants to the cities. This also explains the agricultural reformism of the bourgeoisie and its followers.

And, finally, we come to Colombia's capitalism, a dependent and deforme capitalism with a low accumulation standard and wholly dependent upon coffe the exported monoculture. This "undeveloped" capitalism, nevertheless, show signs of the rapid maturing of monopolistic tendencies. This is not the result c natural development of the productive forces alone, it is based on externa inducements. Imperialist monopolies are the backbone of the local monopolie and imperialist domination is the prime cause of the crisis, the accompanyin unemployment, the fact that peasants have either no land at all or far too littl inflation, rising prices, the transport crisis, freezing of wages, etc. Monopol profits, however, continue to grow. According to the Colombian Institute c Social Security, average monthly wages between 1971-1975 went up 54.7 per cer while the cost of living over the same period skyrocketed 261.5 per cent—a 28 pe cent drop in real wages. This trend persists.

On the basis of its economic analysis the Party proposes the following slogan for the immediate future: return the country's natural wealth, nationalise the o industry; stop foreign capital penetration of industry, including infiltratio through government loans; help the small and middle businessmen an merchants; protect prices on coffee, especially in the producers' interests; trad with the USSR and the other countries of the socialist community; give land t landless or land-hungry peasants; introduce an insurance system covering poo harvests, an eight-hour day, and social rights for farm workers on a par wit industrial workers; help the small and middle rural producers; curtail the powe of the national and foreign monopolies; raise wages and freeze prices; introduce sound currency policy; create more jobs; co-operate with the socialist countrie in capital construction; ensure municipal control of the urban bus service protect rights of land tenants and settle the housing problem in the workin people's interests.

In our fight for these demands we are approaching our strateg goal—national independence, a democratic land reform and abolishing th monopolies. Such are a few elements of the general tactical platform an economic programme which the Party has put forward as an alternative to capitalist solution of the crisis.

---

[1] See *World Marxist Review*, August and October 1975, January, April, July and November 197 May 1977.

The Main Factor for Favourable Changes in the World

BOHUSLAV CHNOUPEK
Member of the CC CPCz, Minister for Foreign Affairs of the CSSR

INTERNATIONAL politics are becoming a focal sphere of the interests of nankind. The foreign policy of the socialist community today is justly recognised to be the driving force behind the dynamic favourable changes in the world. Equipped with the Leninist idea of peaceful coexistence, it shows the way to reshaping international relations to eliminate the danger of war.

The vindication of peaceful coexistence is a result of the evolution of objective social laws as well as of the operation of a subjective factor, sustained struggle by the socialist community and all anti-imperialist forces, over a long period of time. The effort to achieve durable relations with countries belonging o a different social system—relations unaffected by passing considerations—s expressive of both an objective necessity and our subjective interest, an nterest shared by all peace-loving men.

The Leninist policy of peace and social progress followed by the Marxist-Leninist parties and by the peace-loving, progressive, democratic forces making common cause with them is establishing itself as the only correct and effective policy. Leonid Brezhnev said at the 25th CPSU Congress that "the world is hanging before our eyes, and it is changing for the better".

Continuing our discussion of the role of diverse factors influencing the state and volution of international relations. The discussion began with the article "The Helsinki greements and the Struggle for Peace" by Romesh Chandra, Secretary General of he World Peace Council. See *WMR*, May 1977.

The 25th Congress of the CPSU, which carried forward the Peace Programme of the 24th CPSU Congress with due regard to contemporary conditions, became a new powerful incentive for the Soviet Union and other ountries of the socialist community to advance meaningful foreign policy nitiatives. The 15th Congress of Czechoslovakia's Communists expressed their esolve to carry out this programme consistently and creatively. "We can now e much more active in foreign policy," said Gustav Husak, General Secretary f the CC CPCz and President of the Republic, "because we have been perating in close co-ordination with the Soviet Union and other fraternal ountries of the socialist community. We have benefited from the favourable onditions created by the implementation of the Peace Programme of the 4th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. We have contributed our share to the materialisation of this programme. . . . The further laboration of the Peace Programme by the 25th CPSU Congress provides new pportunities for us as well to engage in meaningful foreign policy activity ccording to the requirements, interests and objectives of our state. We fully upport the programme and will contribute to its implementation."

At the 31st Session of the UN General Assembly, the Soviet Union, back*ed by the other countries of the socialist commonwealth, put forward* new pr*oposals intended to bring about a decisive breakthrough towards curbing* a*nd* ending the arms race and achieving disarmament. A comprehensive an*d* specific memorandum which has become an official UN document proposes complete programme for this. These Soviet proposals had a strong impact the deliberations of the 31st General Assembly.

Another highly important indication of the socialist community's consta*nt* effort to remove all remnants of the cold war, carry detente further, elimina*te* the war danger and ensure a lasting peace in Europe and the world is the ne specific proposals of the Political Consultative Committee of the Warsa Treaty countries, which met in Bucharest on November 25 and 26, 1976. Ti title of the declaration adopted—"For New Gains in International Deten for Greater Security and Growing Co-operation in Europe"—is a preci expression of the Warsaw Treaty countries' unrelenting effort to materiali the Helsinki accords and extend detente to the military sphere.

In preparing for further advances in connection with the Belgrade meetir the first post-Helsinki meeting of the countries that took part in the Conferen on Security and Co-operation in Europe, we fully support the position stat by Leonid Brezhnev in his speech to the 16th Congress of Soviet Trade Unior "... The main content of the Belgrade meeting," he said, "should be conce for peace and security in Europe, for growing co-operation among Europe nations. The main tasks of the meeting in the Yugoslav capital should be, our view, not merely to sum up what has been done but to come to terms certain specific recommendations and proposals regarding further co-operation

The socialist countries' foreign policy takes into account the contradicto nature of international development, the fact that while relations betwe capitalist and socialist countries are becoming normalised and the process detente is continuing, which has also found expression in the signing of number of international legal documents since Helsinki, the opponents detente in some capitalist countries have become more active. We have combat a deliberate misinterpretation of the policy of detente, the tenden to assess it not from the point of view of lessening the danger of war ar promoting peace but in terms of solving global problems in accordance wi the imperialists' designs, particularly their desire to handicap socialism ar the national liberation movement. These attempts are bound to miscarry but is absurd to describe their failure as a "crisis" of the policy of detente, whi is exactly what capitalist propaganda does. What we are witnessing is a cris of the outdated tenets of imperialist policy.

By striving to ensure that political detente is complemented with milita detente, the socialist countries tie the hands of reaction, which seeks salvati in making an absolute of armed force. In so doing, it poses as an advocate a detente that would combine "logically" with continuous growth of th imperialist powers' military potential.

The dualism of the official NATO doctrine—the bloc's professed allegian to political detente and intensifying war preparations—suits the most aggre sive forces of the capitalist world. It is, in effect, imposed by the militar industrial complex and is evidence of its might and leverage. To safeguard

rivileged position in capitalist economy and politics the military-industrial omplex tries to convince public opinion that the "free world" is threatened iternally and externally by "international communism".

Reaction invents various stories about the so-called "Soviet threat". It nisrepresents the foreign policy of the socialist countries by attributing to them bid for "world supremacy", which is alleged to be a result of the Communists' "lust for power". It paints life in the socialist countries black and emagogically questions the legitimacy and stability of their social system.

Certain NATO countries try to assume the functions of self-appointed ispectors of the socialist countries' adherence to the Helsinki accords. Yet iey themselves have still to begin carrying out these accords on both a ilateral and a multilateral basis. They probably imagine that the documents pproved at Helsinki are not equally binding on all signatories. This is seen in ieir obvious reluctance to achieve a breakthrough at the Vienna talks on eductions of armaments and armed forces in Central Europe, and in their ttempts to secure unilateral advantages.

Nor has the capitalist West abandoned the malpractice of using trade with ountries of the socialist commonwealth as a means of pressure and extortion imed at obtaining political concessions. Rightists and reactionaries claim that roper political conditions for economic co-operation in Europe are still lacking, and raise hurdles to trade between countries with different social systems. 'he allegation that the Soviet Union and other socialist countries are unreliable artners beset by difficulties serves anti-communist purposes. Certain quarters rovoke public debates on whether or not it pays to grant credits to socialist ountries. Distorting numerous facts, they raise the issue of what they call the ocialist countries' "excessive indebtedness" to the West. They say nothing bout the fact that the socialist countries have always met their commitments y paying off credits punctually, that the socialist countries grant credits to ther countries and that credits are an elementary aspect of foreign trade oday. Incidentally, apologists for imperialism would do well, if they are really oncerned about the problem of "indebtedness", to ponder on the growing oreign trade deficit of the capitalist countries and the policy of government oans which a number of Common Market countries pursue not so much in ie national interest as with the aim of saving the monopolies.

The purpose of all the various fabrications is to dispute the advisability and he very possibility of long-term and mutually beneficial trade and economic o-operation between countries with different social systems.

The tendency to restrict or fetter economic and commercial relations with he socialist countries is rejected by realistic-minded capitalist businessmen, lthough even they are often inconsistent in regard to relations with countries of the socialist community, especially when it comes to materialising the Helsinki accords. However, they admit the importance of economic relations ind trade with the socialist community from the point of view of ensuring conomic growth, preserving jobs and acquiring raw materials and finished roducts. Yet it is essential not only to admit this but to proceed accordingly.

The socialist countries' foreign policy takes into account both favourable ind unfavourable international trends and phenomena. It recognises the possibility of co-operation between socialist and capitalist countries although

the class interests they uphold are opposed. The forms of this co-operatio
and the compromises that are reached do not affect the socialist countries
fundamental positions. They are based on the ideas of peace, security, equalit
and mutual benefit. it will take a good deal of further effort to introduce thes
principles into international relations more widely. The socialist community i
resolved to do all in its power to this end. Much will depend on the other side
the capitalist camp, where realism does not always win the upper hand ove
survivals of the cold war.

We cannot look impassively on the contradictory approach of the rulin
quarters and various alignments of imperialist countries to world processe
Attempts by opponents of detente to co-ordinate their actions are particularl
dangerous. They poison the very climate of international co-operation throug
rhetoric and declarations of intent verging on impermissible interference in th
affairs of the socialist countries. This impairs relations between states an
complicates their development. Those who try for various opportunist reason
to blackmail the socialist community—an attempt doomed to fail—ought t
bear this in mind.

The differences existing between diverse groups of the monopoly bourgeoisi
over foreign policy issues are due to the deepening general crisis of capitalism
The prospect of ending the crisis by means of military ventures has littl
appeal for the ruling classes. Even so, certain groups of the bourgeoisie ar
still hopeful of regaining for imperialism its one-time influence on socia
development.[1] They want to have a decisive say in the capitalist countrie
approach to world politics, an approach comprising both realistic and out
moded methods. Differentiation among the ruling circles of the imperialis
countries arises invariably from the desire to overcome differences and arriv
at a common foreign policy and this often results in concessions to extrem
reactionaries who demand continued confrontation with the socialist countrie
Anti-communism and anti-Sovietism, the greatly increased activity of enemie
of detente, attempts to hinder the development of normal relations betwee
states through every manner of ideological subversion and delaying tactics i
disarmament talks, and above all intensification of the arms race in capitalis
countries are all calculated to poison the atmosphere in Europe, dampen th
European countries' growing mutual confidence in regard to their security
and arouse hostility towards the socialist countries.

The imperialist countries' especial services, which are part of the military
industrial complex, concoct all sorts of false data. This activity is merely a
continuation of the psychological warfare of the fifties. The spurious campaign
over the alleged curtailment of human rights in the socialist countries is a
gross calumny against our system, an attempt to dissemble the fact that it is
capitalism that daily tramples basic human rights underfoot in millions of
cases. Slanderers try to reduce the manifold aspects of the Helsinki Final Act
and its various provisions to a bargain fit for the market-place—they would
like the Soviet Union and other socialist countries to "pay" for the recognition
of postwar frontiers in Europe by making concessions, first of all by providing
a comfortable life for the handful of "dissidents" for whom the capitalist
world has now mounted a massive campaign.

Speaking of the methods used by imperialist propaganda, Gustav Husak

said: "We don't want to underrate this campaign against the socialist countries. Historical experience shows, however, that every campaign based on lies and fraud, every campaign running counter to reality and to our people's awareness, can only end in failure. As for the contemptible puppets who have put themselves at the service of the organisers of such campaigns, they have always ended up on the rubbish-heap of history, and will do so again."

The enemies of detente disguise their counter-attacks with "moral" and other arguments but actually they are motivated by narrow class considerations. The worse the crisis situation in the capitalist countries, the more the bourgeoisie considers it imperative (though this varies from group to group) to resort to diverse forms of anti-communism. And while most countries have left the highest and worst stage of the current economic crisis behind, imperialism is still passing through a most testing period of its history. What makes the situation more difficult is that today there is an alternative to the reactionary policy of imperialism in the form of an anti-imperialist and anti-monopoly approach to reality. It is not accidental that the likelihood of Communist participation in the governments of some West European countries has become one of the main causes of today's reactionary campaigns. Conflicts in capitalist countries are developing in the context of growing working-class, democratic and national liberation movements. The influence of the masses on the foreign policy of exploiting societies is increasing as the class struggle gains in scope. The peoples of the developing countries feel that they neither can, nor want to resign themselves to poverty, ignorance and oppression any longer. They refuse to tolerate neocolonialism and exploitation in any form, no matter how refined. This increased awareness on the part of hundreds of millions has become a decisive factor.

We are realists and we see things as they are. The Helsinki Conference neither could, nor did eliminate the fundamental contradictions between socialism and capitalism but it did indicate how relations between countries belonging to opposed social systems can be developed peacefully. Implementation of the Helsinki accords should stimulate detente and make it more durable.

Reality itself will not let us slacken our "peace offensive". Making peace permanent is a pressing and vitally important task that cannot be accomplished unless NATO statesmen are prevailed on to realise their responsibility for the destinies of nations. It is indispensable that they should proceed without any further procrastination and in a constructive spirit to search in common with the socialist countries for ways of achieving genuine disarmament, materialising detente and transforming it into a universal and irreversible process. As we see it, the peace initiatives advanced by the socialist countries provide a sound basis for this.

The significance of these initiatives is growing as the might of the socialist community increases. The progress of each socialist country and the growing power of the community as a whole tend to restrict the imperialist sphere of influence. The foreign policy of the community is a well-co-ordinated peace offensive and its approach to international problems is thoroughly humanistic.

Marxist-Leninist analysis of the innermost development trends of international relations and cognition of their main laws make it possible to evolve

a policy intimately linking loyalty to principle and to the class goals of socialism with political realism and firm resistance to imperialist attempts at aggression. "Because of their development, their continuous economic growth resulting from the nature of socialist society, which serves the interests of the mass of working people, and because of their foreign policy which is directed towards gaining acceptance for the principles of peaceful coexistence and in extending an ever greater influence on international relations," says the final document of the Conference of Communist and Workers' Parties of Europe (Berlin, 1976), "the socialist countries are playing an outstanding role in preventing a new world war, in strengthening international security and continuing the process of detente."

The socialist countries' foreign policy initiatives are invariably prompted by the socialist class nature of their system. As a result, their policy is conducive to rapid social progress and serves the revolutionary transformation of the world. The community of the interests of the socialist countries and of the fundamental interests of the working people of the world greatly extends the basis for socialist foreign policy, adds to its strength and considerably increases its potentialities.

Both by origin and by its implications, detente goes well beyond the sphere of relations between states. The logic of its evolution makes it part and parcel of social history in all its unity and contradictoriness. Detente has its effect on capitalism and its foreign policy, and even on the evolutionary processes taking place within it. In defining the scope and nature of its impact, we must bear in mind several factors:

— relations between states belonging to the two opposed systems are becoming an increasingly important sphere of manifestation of the fundamental contradictions of our epoch, an arena of their historical competition;

— the transition from cold war to detente is a reflection of the deep crisis of the imperialist policy of aggression; it makes imperialism try to adapt to changing realities;

— adaptation to new international conditions is accompanied by growing realistic trends in the foreign policy of the capitalist countries and, on the other hand, by increasing activity of the enemies of detente;

— the "social parameters" of international relations extend as these relations are reshaped; new groups of people who awaken to the progressive role of socialism and the regressive role of capitalism join in the struggle for peace and detente.

The policy of peaceful coexistence, whose purpose is to curb aggressive imperialist forces, is entirely in keeping with the interests of the masses fighting for national liberation, democracy and social progress. Loyalty to proletarian internationalism, increasing solidarity of the working class and Communist parties, and consolidation of all anti-imperialist forces are an important condition for winning the struggle for detente, international security and co-operation and for guaranteeing mankind a socially progressive future.

The role of the socialist countries' foreign policy in the international class struggle and the link between international relations and the world revolutionary process have always been of fundamental importance. In the policy and ideology of the revolutionary working-class movement, the tasks involved

achieving durable peace and strengthening the working people's international unity are inseparable. Anti-communists try hard to sever this link, to counterpose the struggle for lasting peace to proletarian internationalism and in this way weaken both. This accounts for the close interlocking of the two goals of the current anti-communist and anti-Soviet campaigns in capitalist countries—dealing a blow at detente and undermining socialist and proletarian internationalism. The world bourgeoisie's persistent attempts to accomplish this twofold task are prompted by the desire to salvage the last exploiting social formation.

We are proud of the fact that the CSSR takes an active part in working out and co-ordinating the socialist countries' initiatives and in carrying them into practice. The progress in solving foreign-policy and economic problems made by our people under the leadership of the CPCz has provided favourable conditions for this.

Czechoslovak foreign policy has a vastly diversified programme to fulfil this year. We will conduct meaningful negotiations, solve problems, establish new contacts, extend old ones and raise their level; there will be visits, meetings, consultations and new agreements. We will continue to implement the foreign policy decisions of the 15th CPCz Congress, whose purpose is to help create favourable external conditions for building a developed socialist society in the CSSR and for promoting peace.

Closely co-operating with the Soviet Union and other socialist countries, the CSSR will do all in its power for the further consolidation of the positions of the socialist countries, of all democratic and progressive forces of the world, for peace and security on our planet. Attainment of these historic goals will meet our people's innermost needs, wishes and interests.

---

[1] Their attitude is exemplified by the approach of Senator Daniel P. Moynihan, former US delegate to the UN. He calls for a "tough" policy towards the Soviet Union and other socialist countries, hoping that this can prevent a "decline in America's ideological influence, conventional military strength and total power around the world" (see *International Herald Tribune*, March 14, 1977).

The Forces for Change in Britain

DAVE COOK

Executive Committee member, Communist Party of Great Britain (National Organiser)

ON December 15, 1976, Chancellor of the Exchequer Dennis Healey announced a "mini-budget" which he claimed was designed to promote economic recovery and the fastest possible return to a high and substantial level of employment. In fact Healey's measures, agreed to by the International Monetary Fund as the price of its standby loan of £2,300m.[1] represent the most draconian application yet of the policies with which the right-wing Labour government has argued that the economic crisis can be solved.

For nine successive budgets there have been cuts in public expenditure. Reductions in the main Rate Support grant, and the phasing out of food subsidies will provide new variants to the now traditional cuts in local authority capital programmes, and cut-backs of new projects. In addition this time the government threw in a blatant measure of denationalisation by its decision to sell £500m government shares in British Petroleum.

The government's strategy, and no doubt the terms of the IMF loan, rest upon their intention to continue the Social Contract with the TUC.[2] Just how effective this distinguished form of wage restraint has been from the employers' point of view was revealed by Department of Employment figures for the four months from the end of July to November 1976, which showed earnings increases of 3.5 per cent compared with a 5.1 per cent rise in the retail price index. Even the official report of the government's Price Commission foresees no prospect of the rate of inflation easing before the summer, so a continuation of the Social Contract would see a further worsening of working-class living standards.

These deflationary pressures are compounded by the impact of the massive cuts in public expenditures. Adult unemployment in the UK stood at a post-war peak in January of this year, and the figure is widely predicted to keep on rising. A graphic illustration of the connection between government spending cuts and recession in major industries is provided by the "Construction Forecasts" of the Building and Civil Engineering Manufacturers, who predict that construction output will continue to fall for the next two years, as it has done since 1974.

In a sense the capitulation to the International Monetary Fund, which these policies represent, symbolises the final abandonment of the promises for social reform in Labour's 1974 Manifesto.

Yet on three of the central questions these policies are ostensibly designed to tackle—inflation, unemployment and the level of investment—all recent indices reveal that the crisis persists and indeed deepens. Even the projections of Callaghan and Healey themselves predict no short-term relief. In fact, the forecast of the London Business School reported in January predicts an unemployment level of 2 million by 1979.[3] A recent answer to a Parliamentary question revealed 13 million, or roughly a quarter of the population, living on or slightly above the official "poverty line".

This worsening situation in Britain takes place against a background of persistent economic crisis in the capitalist world—and to this the expanding economies of the socialist countries stand in sharp contrast. The strait-jacket imposed by capitalist policies is not limited to our economy, however. In reaction to the crisis of imperialist dominance in southern Africa, and the consolidation of liberation and socialist advance in Angola and Mozambique. Ivor Richard, British Ambassador in the United Nations, ricocheted around the continent in frantic emulation of Kissinger's attempts to stem the tide of freedom. On a wider canvas, world pressure for detente and disarmament demands a break with reactionary policies just as urgently as does an economy racked by crisis.

The issue of policy to tackle the economic crisis dominates the political stage, and the battle around it could decide whether there is to be an early

general election, and its outcome. Recent by-election results confirm trends which, if they continue, could further decimate Labour's vote in elections, greatly strengthen the Tories, as well as open the way for increased fascist votes.

There has been a marked shift to the right by Margaret Thatcher's majority grouping in the Conservative leadership. This has been expressed in a number of ways, firstly in policy terms, as their recent programme "The Right Approach" revealed, and changes in their front bench personnel reinforce this trend. There has been a significantly more aggressive stance towards the tiny Labour majority in the House of Commons.[4] Aided by their grotesquely undemocratic dominance of the House of Lords, and defections by right-wing Labour MPs, they have succeeded in degutting parts of Parliamentary bills to nationalise areas of the docks. Thatcher's cold war style utterances have grown apace. The Tories become revealed more and more openly as bitter opponents of detente.

The Communist Party is categorical about the need to force decisive changes in policy to maintain a Labour government, and prevent the disaster of a Tory comeback, with all its consequences of harsher attacks on living standards, and setbacks for progressive policies nationally and internationally.

How can this be done?

The Tory Parliamentary offensive and the evidence of Labour's worsening votes are undoubtedly mounting pressure in the labour movement to accept that what is needed is to close ranks behind the present policies of the government. One section of the left in the Parliamentary Labour Party are falling victims to this pressure. However, others have become more outspoken in their demand for left policies as the crisis has deepened. The way to tackle the crisis and save Labour from electoral defeat is action for fighting alternatives not acquiescence in IMF blackmail.

Over recent months elements of the left alternative economic policy for which the Communist Party has consistently campaigned have begun to surface as central issues for debate both in the movement and in the media, for example the demand for selective import controls; for cutbacks in the military expenditure; a questioning of the reserve currency role of sterling. Commentators who speak of the "alternative" economic strategy do not mean that offered by the Tories, which differs from the government only in the degree to which the screw will be turned. They mean that offered by the left. There is considerable common ground on key elements of this policy amongst the Communist Party, the *Tribune* Group in the Labour Party, many trade unions, and the Labour Party national Executive Committee.

However a significant feature of the last months has not only been that the interest in left policies has been growing, but also that there have been glimpses of the potential that they possess for rallying support.

Firstly, on the question of the public expenditure cuts. There have been powerful demonstrations and lobbies of Parliament and local councils. Although not a mobilisation for a clearcut left programme, these have none the less been intimately bound up with questions of the alternative.

Secondly, on devolution.[5] Elected assemblies with real powers for Wales and Scotland are a long overdue measure of democratic and national justice, and a

central question for British politics. Despite the limitations of the present Bill, opposition to it by any Labour MPs would play into the hands of the nationalist parties and lessen support for Labour in Wales and Scotland.

Communists have been very clear that devolution in itself will not solve the problems of these two countries. Left politics and left government are needed there, just as they are for Britain as a whole. However, democratic assemblies with real powers, which can give the people greater opportunities to bring their weight to bear on these problems, can make a powerful contribution to the pressure for left policies.

As with all moves towards greater democracy, the Devolution Bill has opened up divisions in the Tory ranks. The issue has also divided some of the left. It is vital to win full understanding that unless the Labour movement becomes the unequivocating vehicle of devolution, the rise of the nationalist movement will not be reversed, with all the dangers that this has for grave splits in the working-class movement.

The dangers to Labour and the working class do not only come from the possibilities of a Tory comeback or the rise of nationalist votes. There are constitutional dangers in the present situation. The speculation about the need for a Bill of Rights, aimed at limiting the power of Parliament, for some form of constitutional court, or a restraining power over the Commons by the judiciary; all these represent a response by some sections of the ruling class to the strains the crisis is beginning to place on traditional political institutions.

Suddenly, after accepting a largely unwritten constitution for centuries, there is now a sudden urge by our ruling class to put our rights down on paper, and hand over their defence, not to Parliament, but to the courts. In other words, to submit to the erosion of that sovereignty of Parliament which was won through bitter struggle against arbitrary rule. One of the unique features of the British political system is the potentially enormous power, in constitutional terms, of the elected House of Commons—unrestricted by written constitution, constitutional court, or "division of powers". It is this potential power being used by a Labour government forced to operate left alternative policies to tackle the crisis, that this ruling class speculation is designed to close.

And what of the British judiciary, to whom the right wing wish to entrust the job of "controlling" Parliament? Of 317 judges in 1974 no fewer than 89 per cent were educated at public schools, 70 per cent went to Oxford or Cambridge. Judges in the House of Lords are paid £21,175 a year, and in the Court of Appeal £17,425. There are no women in either court.

Therefore on the central questions of policy to tackle the crisis, on devolution, and in answer to the constitutional dangers, the policies put forward by the Communist Party, the *Morning Star* and important sections of the left, provide the way of preventing a Tory return. Just as it was class struggle which created the conditions for the defeat of Edward Heath in 1974, so too can mass action to change Labour's policy now help create the conditions which can sustain it in a general election.

What are the forces that hold the key to generating mass struggle of a sufficient scale to achieve this?

The recent period has revealed something of their extent and potential. The great November 17 demonstration against the public expenditure cuts brought

ogether members of twelve national trade unions, with the public sector and teaching unions achieving a magnificent turn-out. There were 10,000 students on that demonstration. The participation of women and black trade unionists was remarkable, exceeding anything on similar actions in recent years.

This action of the working class was supported by the Labour Party National Executive Committee, a historic decision which symbolised some of the left advances within the Labour Party. The following week there was an impressive array of Constituency Labour Parties and black people's organisations on the TUC/Labour Party joint demonstration against racism.

Campaigning organisations against the cuts exist in some cities and the potential for uniting Co-op societies, women's and black people's organisations, student unions, neighbourhood councils and community politics movements along with trades councils and trade unions, is great.

However, as well as revealing the potential, the November/December actions also spotlighted the major problem posed by the acceptance of the Social Contract by the trade union movement. This was illustrated by the inadequate participation in the cuts demonstration and lobby by members of industrial trade unions, notwithstanding the decisions of the AUEW executive to support the action late in the day and the presence on it of building workers, miners and engineers.

The curtailment of the wages struggle which the contract has achieved has exerted a demobilising effect on the preparedness and ability of workers to take action on a whole range of isues. For example, statistics produced by the Department of Employment show that the number of strikes in 1976 was the lowest for ten years. All the discussion, involvement and solidarity which can accompany mass collective struggle has been restricted. This is one of the main reasons why the rejection of the Social Contract is such an important objective if the united mobilisation of the whole labour movement is to be achieved.

However, there are signs that its grip is loosening. In a number of important plants—particularly in the motor industries, there have been declarations of opposition to the Social Contract, and a groundswell of support for a return to free collective bargaining is building up. This is beginning to impact on the Labour Party leadership and the TUC General Council, sharpening the left-right struggles within them. These indicate the possibility of action that will challenge, and indeed is challenging, whatever form of new deal Healey and Callaghan are trying to concoct with the TUC leaders. The struggle for a left alternative in tackling the crisis by this Labour government is intimately connected to defeating the Social Contract. In supporting and developing this growing movement against wage restraint and the philosophy underlying it the *Morning Star* is playing a major role.

It is no accident that coinciding with those possibilities for greater unity and action in the labour movement, there has been a sharply escalated ideological offensive against the left. Part of this has been at the level of a crude witch-hunt. Although the right wing's finger is ostensibly pointed at alleged infiltration into the Labour Party, in reality it is at isolating and smearing all those who argue against government policy that the current campaign is aimed.

In the same way that Lord Hailsham now rushes to describe Parliamentary

government, long paraded as Britain's supreme contribution to the Western "way of life", as an "elective dictatorship", the Labour right wing attack the assertion of democracy in the Labour Party, now that it threatens some of them. The left must stand firm in support of the democratic principles that Constituency Labour Parties should have the right to reselect their candidates, that the Labour government should operate the decisions of its own conference, and that trade unions should have the right to send delegates of their choice, including Communists, to Labour Party bodies, and that Marxism is an integral and legitimate part of the labour movement.

Coinciding with these sharpening controversies around democracy, devolution and policy to tackle the crisis, was the publication in January of the long awaited Bullock Report on Industrial Democracy.[6] Over recent years there has been a growing demand in the labour movement for extending industrial democracy in the formulation and taking of major decisions. The crisis of British capitalism is at the same time marked by contraction, but also tremendous technical change. The threat, and the reality of redundancy, round the clock working, mobility, job evaluation, measured day work, impose relentless pressures for radical alteration in working conditions. These objective circumstances compel the organised workers to demand a say in questions which hitherto were regarded as management's responsibility. Similarly they add a new urgency to the long-standing strategic objective of the employers to incorporate trade union organisation into the processes of management.

The Bullock Report reflects these contradictory pressures. It was greeted with concerted hostility by the Confederation of British Industry and editorial comment by the capitalist press. There are several reasons for this hostility. Firstly, it provides damning evidence that the rate of concentration of economic power in a relatively small number of companies has been faster than in most countries. Secondly, the Report exposes supervisory boards as an important facade to hide where in fact the real decision-making power lies, namely, the executive board on which there would be no workers. In line with the evidence submitted by the Communist Party, it comes out in favour of a single board, responsible for both making and executing policy.

However, the Bullock Report also contains some very dangerous proposals both of an ideological as well as practical nature, which are fundamentally harmful to the achievement of the objective of greater industrial democracy in the private sector. It resurrects the discredited capitalist concept that "capital and labour are equal partners". It attempts to limit the range of subjects which can be dealt with by free collective bargaining, proven in practice to be the only real way of extending the areas where workers can have a say in privately owned firms. Finally, and most dangerously, Bullock proposes that the "worker directors" should be shop stewards. This would undermine the independent role of the trade unions, and lead to the alienation of the shop stewards from those they represent. In other words, the report is a recipe for class collaboration.

However, the publication of the Report, at the time when the movement against the Social Contract, demanding a return to free collective bargaining, is beginning to build up, adds an important dimension to the political debate in the labour movement. This discussion raises in sharp form issues of owner-

ship and democracy, and gives an opportunity for the Communist Party to help win unity and clarity on these fundamental questions.

It is precisely at this moment, when the issue of Marxism is being debated in the movement and when the question of how to reverse Labour's slide to disaster confronts all socialists, that the new draft of the Communist Party Programme, the *British Road to Socialism*, has been published. One of the roles of a Marxist party is to be the centre of discussion on the left on the issues that face the movement. The new draft is not just a repetition of our Marxist position, but is a major development of our ideas. The discussion that has exploded around it could not have come at a better time for the left in British politics.

But above all a revolutionary party must provide action guided by Marxism. The central question facing the left today is how, given the still present but weakening grip of social contract thinking on the trade movement, a massive wave of struggle can be developed against the consequences of government policy. For this to happen there must be clarity about the left alternative, and the development of strength and unity that will compel a different approach to the crisis by the government.

In achieving that united struggle the contribution of the main organised Marxist force, the Communist Party, and the daily paper of the left, the *Morning Star*, can be of central importance. This is the challenge facing the Party and the left in 1977.

London, March 1977.

---

[1] This is the fourth large loan Britain has been granted of late. In exchange for the loan the IMF demanded heavy budget cuts. Public spending has been slashed, except on the armed forces and police.—*Ed.*

[2] Seeking the trade unions' consent to a wage restraint despite the incessant price rises, the Labour government promised drastic measures for economic recovery. The resulting Social Contract signed in July 1975 for a term of two years, far from removing the causes of inflation and unemployment, as promised by the Labour leaders, led to a further decline in living standards.—*Ed.*

[3] The unemployment level was 1.5 million at the end of last year.—*Ed.*

[4] The Tories even asked for a vote of no confidence in the present government. Realising they were in real danger of going into opposition if this was put to the vote, the Labour leadership decided to foil the Tory offensive by striking a deal with the Parliamentary Liberal Party. Under the terms of the agreement the government actually renounced many of its projected "socialist-oriented" measures. This aroused criticism from the Labour Left, which has increased since Labour's defeat in the March by-elections in Stechford and elsewhere. The Left attributes this setback to the Social Contract policy, Healey's anti-labour budget, and "Callaghan's shabby Labour-Liberal deal".—*Ed.*

[5] Partial transference of power to regional assemblies in Scotland and Wales.—*Ed.*

[6] Published on January 26, this year.—*Ed.*

New Front of the Struggle Against Imperialism

HUGO FAZIO
WMR representative of Communist Party of Chile

ECONOMIC integration is becoming an increasingly important front in the fight for national liberation in Latin America, a fight in which imperialism and the domestic imperialist-backed economic groupings are confronted by those elements in the subcontinent that in varying degrees of consistency and depth are seeking economic independence and full national sovereignty. The present set-up is generating what Fidel Castro has called "various forms of associations of every possible shade, from the obviously reactionary to those that are inspired by progressive aims and the need to protect themselves from the greed of the international monopolies" (*Granma*, January 19, 1977).

So as matters stand at present, no one should try to give blanket assessments of the different integrating processes or projects in our countries. Nevertheless it is becoming increasingly obvious that these processes do not always operate in favour of the international monopolies. This is a new phenomenon These processes show an increasing tendency to flow their own way, as can be seen, for example, from the situation in the Andes Pact.[1]

Using the Pinochet dictatorship as a Trojan horse, US imperialism launched an attack on the pact in an attempt to nullify the progressive substance of the decisions passed by the member countries or, failing this, to get it abolished altogether. The upshot was that the Chilean fascist junta withdrew from the pact in October 1976. In January of this year it virtually stopped participating in the Andes development corporation[2] as well. Meanwhile the other countries belonging to the pact have affirmed their determination to go ahead with the integration process as previously envisaged. It is quite clear, however, that such setbacks for imperialism with regard to Latin American integration will not end its confrontation with the countries of the subcontinent. One can be pretty sure that the subversive operations of international capital will continue in new forms.

The trend towards integration has a thoroughly objective basis. As Lenin stressed, any capitalist enterprise must inevitably branch out beyond the framework of the commune, the local market, the region and, ultimately, the state. Such a pattern was bound to emerge in the Latin American countries, where capitalist production relations have prevailed for a considerable time, although they are somewhat deformed owing to their dependence on imperialism. For many companies in Latin America (particularly the subsidiaries of international monopolies with capital invested in at least one of the countries in the area and trying to gain control over the markets of the others) the subcontinent as a whole presents a natural outlet on to the foreign market. The tendency increases as production structures develop.

The home markets of the Latin American countries have remained narrow With the social and economic structures still unchanged the existing produc-

tion relations virtually exclude a substantial portion of the population from the sphere of commodity-money relations or cut their purchasing power to the minimum. According to the UN Economic Commission for Latin America (ECLA), 100 million out of the 300 million Latin Americans live in dire poverty. Added to which, 65 of those 100 million live in rural areas where a natural economy is even more prevalent. The capacity of the home market in many Latin American countries is so small that it is sometimes unprofitable to develop certain industries merely for satisfying home demand. Hence the pressing need for outlets on to the foreign market for firms that want to expand. In many cases it is a matter of survival.

Under present conditions this problem can to some extent be solved only by trade within the region. The exceptions are the traditional Latin American exports, particularly raw materials, that play an important part in the international capitalist division of labour. But the Latin American countries' share in the world market is steadily diminishing. The seriousness of the problem is illustrated by the fact that in percentage terms their exports are constantly dwindling compared with those of other developing countries.

On the other hand, trade within the region is growing, thus enhancing the need for economic co-ordination. Naturally, co-ordination cannot be equally applied to all countries of the region because their economic levels are by no means equal. This means that the expansion of trade mainly benefits the more economically developed countries and above all the international monopolies that wield power in Latin America. The basic and steadily growing part of this trade is cornered by the more developed countries—Brazil, Mexico and Argentina. This trend is particularly noticeable in the export of manufactured goods. In 1973, according to ECLA, the three above-mentioned countries produced 79 per cent of the total output of manufactured goods in Latin America. At the same time these are the countries where international capital is concentrated in the manufacturing industries. So in the final analysis the successes of these countries tend to significantly increase domination by imperialist capital.

As a result a growing proportion of the trade between the Latin American countries themselves and with other countries takes place through the multinationals. Sufficient to note that in the early seventies 70.7 per cent of the goods imported by the North American subsidiaries in Latin America came from the United States.

The failure of the attempt at integration within the framework of the Latin American Free Trade Association (ALLC)[3] may be attributed mainly to the fact that its operating mechanism, besides aggravating the structural contradictions and intensifying the internal differences of development in the Latin American countries, placed them in a position of even greater dependence and promoted the expansion of foreign capital. When the decisions adopted by ALLC were put into practice, they inevitably led to increased domination by the most powerful capital and by the multinational companies, particularly in industries where they had a special interest, because all private companies, national or foreign, were granted equal rights. The outcome was that ALLC, which had been conceived as a regional association for protecting the interests of the countries of the subcontinent, failed to achieve its aims. The association's

activities were particularly harmful to the less economically develope countries.

ALLC is a typical example of an attempt to achieve integration in th interests of foreign capital. And this was the reason for its collapse. "An integration measure carried out under imperialist protection," Fidel Castr has observed, "will always be unreliable politically and economically. For on thing it is incapable of eliminating internal inequality and discriminatio between the stronger and weaker partners. What is more, . . . as the imperialis policies of the United States have demonstrated, an alliance between them wi always envisage perpetuation of unequal exchange with the less develope countries" (*Granma*, January 19, 1977). The efforts of the most reactionar circles in Latin America to reanimate ALLC and preserve its methods an forms of activity are doomed to failure.

The setting up in 1969 of the Andes Pact was to a considerable extent reaction to the failure of ALLC. The bourgeois circles in the countries tha signed the Cartagena Agreement had realised that integration must be achieve by co-ordinating the economic development of these countries, limiting th scope of foreign capital and introducing protectionist measures. To accelerat development they decided to use the advantages offered by an enlarged marke

The Cartagena agreement, which was designed to achieve these aims, di not result, like ALLC, in the usual measures for mutual tariff cuts. Althoug its initiators differed as to the best ways of solving the problems of their ow countries, they did try to find answers to the crucial questions of developmen confronting the member countries in general.

In the course of time their decisions began to have effects reaching beyon their original plans. They evolved a common policy for restricting the activitie of foreign capital (Decision 24[4]). They embarked on joint industrial pro gramming designed to develop industries that would otherwise not have bee feasible in the subregion in view of the limited markets of the countrie involved. Of great importance also was the introduction of a general externa customs duty in respect of non-participating countries as a form of collectiv protection offering real advantages for trade in the goods produced in the sub region. Another essential factor is the system of automatic reduction of custom rates (never achieved by ALLC) and the granting of special advantages to les developed Bolivia and Ecuador.

Among these measures Decision 24 is crucial and no one will be surprise to hear that it is the focus of attacks by international capital, which has decide that its positions in Latin America and also the direction of this region's futur development depend largely on the success or failure of the Andes Pact, it strength and cohesion.[5] The US monopolies, in particular, are determined no to lose their unrestricted dominance in any region because they are makin huge profits out of our countries.[6]

The favourable balance of forces in the subregion at the beginning of the present decade, when Salvador Allende became President of Chile and general Velasco Alvarado and Juan Jose Torres headed the governments of Peru and Bolivia, gave a big boost to fulfilment of the Cartagena agreement. This was the period, at the end of 1970, when Decision 24 was passed. But this fact though of great importance, should not overshadow the positive role played

by other social and political forces of the subregion. In the case of Chile, one cannot deny the role played by Eduardo Frei's Christian Democratic government when the Andes Pact was negotiated.[7]

The Andes Pact and its further development bear out the conclusion reached by the Conference of Communist Parties of the countries of Latin America and the Caribbean (Havana, 1975), which stressed that the Communists "while not relaxing the struggle for democratic rights and for building a new internal structure for our countries . . . are prepared to support and encourage the positions of Latin American governments that come out in defence of our natural resources or intend to halt the multinational companies' drive to preserve and strengthen their hold over the economy of our countries".

The postures adopted within the Andes Pact have become clearer with the passage of time. The progressive forces that originally gave too little attention to the process of integration, have become aware of its real significance and have taken up clear-cut positions on this question. Their assessment of the value of the pact starts from the main contradiction, namely, the contradiction between imperialism and the forces advocating economic independence and sovereign development for the region.

In recent years, various segments of the national bourgeoisie who have seen something to their advantage in many of the decisions passed, particularly those restricting the activity of foreign capital and protecting the economies of their countries, have also defined their positions on the basis of their own interests. In Colombia, for example, the Andi and Fedemetal businessmen's associations began by opposing implementation of Decision 24. But as the journal of the Colombian Communists, *Documentos Politicos*, writes, "with the development of the bigger market and control over foreign capital . . . the force of reality turned them into supporters of the Decision and opponents of the Chilean position. Some of their members had decided that with an expanded market they would be able to sell more and therefore increase their returns. All this would have been threatened if there had been an unrestricted flow of foreign capital."

The way things have turned out has led some circles in Chile to deduce similar conclusions. We shall cite only one example. While the fascist junta's attacks on the Cartagena agreement were growing, the Association of Metallurgical Industrialists (ASIMET) drew attention to the fact that "the Andes market is highly important for the sale of Chilean industrial goods", particularly those produced by ASIMET firms because they produce the country's most important industrial goods (*El Mercurio*, Sept. 21, 1976).

These positions were, of course, dictated by specific conditions that should not be forgotten today, when Latin America is beginning to see the necessity of defending its natural wealth, winning economic independence and fighting for a new pattern of world economic relations based on equality. This must be remembered if we are to correctly define the future tactics of the working class and popular forces.

The Andes Pact remains an area of conflict between the aspirations of the national forces of the member countries and the attempts of international capital to maintain its supremacy. So for the peoples of the member countries it is important to realise the negative consequences that Chile's withdrawal

from the Andes Pact has had for the Chilean economy. These consequences provide a further argument for keeping and developing the accord on subregional integration.

One such consequence has been an intensification of the process, encouraged by fascism, of abolishing whole industries. The junta's minister of the economy Pablo Baraona has declared that "deep-going changes" are taking place in the country's "traditional industrial structure". This is the cover-up for the process of liquidating many spheres of national economic activity. Fascism is blotting out industries that cannot survive the shrinking of the internal market and the consequences of throwing open the doors to foreign goods that oust the home product. This has increased dependence to the maximum. As the profound economic crisis indicates, Chile's economy has become extremely vulnerable to the shockwaves rocking the economies of the imperialist powers. Her exit from the Andes Pact has accelerated the process of economic rundown. Numerous investment schemes designed to expand the market have been cancelled or suspended. Most of the 14 new schemes envisaged in the Programme for Development of the Metallurgical and Engineering Industries evolved by the Development Corporation in 1975 "have been discarded, others paralysed" (*El Mercurio*, Nov. 15, 1976). These schemes were worth a total of $76,342,000. Scrapping them adds fresh complications to the chronic shortage of investments characteristic of the whole period of fascist rule.

Enterprises set up previously with a view to exporting substantial quantities of goods to the Andes Pact countries have been compelled to close down some of their departments or drastically curtail production. In many cases this has meant sacking workers, who as usual have to bear the brunt of the crisis. Withdrawal from the Andes Development Corporation also deprived Chile of good opportunities for building up certain branches of the economy. Before the decision to withdraw was taken, this organisation used to finance in Chile about 20 projects valued at approximately $30 million. Some of the projects involved use of the subregion's market. There were loans for others in the pipeline.

The policies of the fascist junta are all part of the general strategy of US imperialism in Latin America, particularly the south. In addition to attempts to disrupt or slow down processes with progressive significance for Latin America, the US monopolies are also seeking ways of consolidating their positions and extending their sway. Hence the raptures with which international capital welcomed the economic policies adopted by some countries in the southern half of the subcontinent. Wrote *Business Week*, August 9, 1976. "There is good news coming out of Latin America for the hundreds of US and other foreign companies with a stake in this vast region: In a startling turnabout, major countries are opening their doors wider to private enterprise. Multinational executives who have been watching one Latin American country after another pull back from the radicalism of the early 1970s today consider the region to be one of the world's major investment opportunities." *Business Week* concluded emphatically that the "new economic thinking" in Latin America is today concentrated on the "Southern Cone", and that this is happening just when "this area is . . . in a position to play a significant role in the world's industrial economy". This "startling turnabout" could have hap-

pened, of course, only through imperialism's disruptive activities and the setting up of fascist or profascist regimes in a number of countries.

Imperialism's global strategy assigns a specific role to each country of this region. Chile, for example, is supposed to produce goods that have "relative advantages". This means basically raw materials, particularly minerals, and also goods whose manufacture does not require heavy investment and sophisticated technology but assumes an abundance of cheap manpower.

The economic "model" for Chile executed by fascism is in clear contradiction to the country's actual level of development. Its imposition implies not only liquidation of the people's democratic gains, but also a cutting back of the country's production capacities for the benefit of foreign interests. Defence of the industries that fascism is sending to the wall has become an important watchword for the anti-fascist forces. They regard the democratic gains that the country won mainly through popular struggle under former governments as their birthright.

The consequences for Chile of its withdrawal from the Andes Pact underline the need to press ahead with integration processes that make for economic independence. The objective necessity for joint efforts on the part of the countries of Latin America has not disappeared and will continue to dictate the need for regional integration.

The experience of the Cartagena agreement and also the formation of the Latin American Economic System (SELA[8]), from which the United States is barred, the creation of multinational Latin American enterprises that do not admit imperialist firms, the activities of a number of associations for protecting prices on raw materials—all this indicates the new trend in the process of integration in Latin America.

SELA is the first such organisation which besides setting up a permanent system of consultations and co-ordination for achieving common positions on various social and economic questions, and also in relation to international organisations, third countries and groups of countries, is making concrete efforts to accelerate the social and economic development of the member countries. SELA is setting up action committees for drafting projects and programmes for specific branches of the economy, especially organisations providing information on surpluses and shortages of farm products. In addition the production and marketing of fertilisers and implements are being developed; a technological information network is being set up among the member countries; housing projects and social development schemes are under way.

Thus SELA activities are acquiring far wider scope than the Special Latin American Co-ordinating Commission (SECLA) had in the past decade. This organisation undoubtedly played a positive part, but it confined itself to co-ordinating the participation of the countries in UN conferences on trade and development (UNCTAD) and the drafting of general platforms for promoting them at international conferences and defining positions in relation to third countries, particularly the United States.

In recent years more organisations have been set up in Latin America and the Caribbean that reflect the growing urge for joint action. Their formation involved certain difficulties. They were attacked by the international mono-

polies and the government circles of the United States. This could not have been otherwise in view of the aims adopted by these organisations. Cuba's participation gave these organisations an entirely new significance. At the same time their emergence is a blow to the reactionary conception of "ideological frontiers".[9] The urge of the Latin American countries and peoples for unity is steadily ousting the long since decayed notion of pan-Americanism.

It is quite clear that the basic factor determining the significance of the integration processes, and, hence, the activities of the various associations currently appearing in our countries, is the position they adopt in relation to the international monopolies, to imperialist capital. The end results of these processes will depend on the balance of forces that develops in these organisations and in the member countries, on the leverage that is achieved by the working-class movement and all the democratic forces with an interest in the economic independence of the Latin American countries.

---

[1] The Cartagena agreement on economic integration was signed by Bolivia, Colombia, Peru, Chile and Ecuador in May 1969 and came into force at the end of that year. Venezuela joined later.

[2] Financial corporation set up by six signatories of the Cartagena agreement, performs the function of an investment bank. Its aim is to promote various Andes integration projects.

[3] ALLC (Asociacion Latinoamericana de Libre Comerico) was set up under the Treaty of Montevido, signed February 18, 1960, by Argentina, Brazil, Mexico, Paraguay, Peru, Uruguay and Chile. Later joined by Colombia and Ecuador (1961), Venezuela (1966) and Bolivia (1967).

[4] The decision lays it down that any foreign enterprise set up after July 1, 1971, must become a mixed or national enterprise within 15 years of its inauguration. The amount of profit that can be taken out of the country cannot exceed 14 per cent of the invested capital. Use of technology cannot be considered as capital investment and in a number of sectors (banks, insurance, communal services, transport, etc.) foreign investment is banned altogether.

[5] See, *Latin America's New Internationalism. The End of Hemispheric Isolation*, New York, Washington, London, 1976, p. 312.

[6] Lately, they have been taking an annual two billion dollars clear profit out of the Latin American countries. Our continent gets 62 per cent of the total North American investment in the countries of the "Third World". The profit rate of 14.3 per cent is double that of the return on capital invested in the United States or Canada. Investments pay for themselves in less than seven years.

[7] Although Decision 24 was passed when Allende had been head of state for 50 days, the preceding process of drawing up the decision involved representatives of the Frei administration.

[8] SELA—regional consultative organisation with international legal status for co-ordinating co-operation and economic and social development.

[9] For many years this conception was one of the bastions of imperialist strategy in Latin America. It boils down to justification of interference in the affairs of any country of the subcontinent on the pretext of combating "communist infiltration". In the view of its authors "ideological" frontiers are more important than state boundaries.

Afghanistan Chooses Roads of Development

HAMID SAFARI
Executive Bureau member, Central Committee, People's Party of Iran

CHANGES in Asia over the past few years are indicative of the increasing anti-imperialist and anti-capitalist orientation of liberation movements. Several factors have contributed to this: the steadily changing balance of class forces on the international scene in favour of peace, democracy and socialism; the greater impact on world development of the active peace policy of the Soviet Union and other countries of the socialist community; the continuing process of international detente. It is against this background that one should see the Asian peoples' intensifying struggle for national independence and for a development path that offers optimal opportunities for social, economic and political progress. One such struggle began with the abolition (in July 1973) of the monarchy in neighbouring Afghanistan, an institution which had served as a bulwark of feudalism and reaction. Its overthrow accorded with the deep aspirations of the Afghani people, their desire for a better life And to achieve that they had first to remove the ossified structures that were an obstacle to all forward movement.

Achievements and Difficulties

Speaking in May 1976 on the 57th anniversary of Afghanistan's independence, the Prime Minister and future President of the Republic, Muhammed Daud,[1] noted that the injust and anachronistic social relations under the monarchy, the crying social inequality, poverty and widespread illiteracy had prevented the consolidation of national independence. In those years Afghanistan was in the throes of a profound economic, social and political crisis that had brought the country to the brink of catastrophe. The monarchy was overthrown by the anti-monarchic, anti-feudal and anti-imperialist struggle of the labouring masses. This created the prerequisites for much-needed social and economic changes.

The leaders of the new republic realised that social and economic development was impossible as long as feudal-capitalist relations continued. They gave the country a new slogan, "Afghani socialism", as a means of achieving social justice and ending class inequality and antagonisms. Afghani socialism, they declared, would be based on the national philosophy and culture, on the objective and subjective conditions of the Afghani people and on Islam.

Afghanistan's revolutionary-democratic forces believe that certain aspects of this doctrine can play a positive role in the battle against imperialism, neo-colonialism and feudal-bourgeois ideology. It is significant that the leaders of the new republic rejected capitalist development as unsuitable, as something that would only increase property inequality and aggravate social antagonisms which, in turn, would hamper economic progress. But the revolutionary-democratic forces are strongly opposed to all attempts to replace the principles

of scientific socialism with the vague and inconsistent slogan of "nationa socialism.

Their aim is genuine economic independence, higher living and cultu standards, fuller use of manpower and natural resources. The struggle f these aims, they believe, will gradually produce new social relations free all exploitation.

These forces admit that there have been no radical changes in this directi since the overthrow of the monarchy, though the government's policy sta ment of August 23, 1973, envisages higher growth rates in basic industri stronger state influence on the development of foreign trade and on financ and currency policy, modernisation of the tax system, agrarian refor restructuring of the education system and expansion of the state sector. T government is also providing favourable conditions for more private capital enterprise, emphasising, however, that private investments in industry will closely controlled and co-operation between the state and private sect co-ordinated to assure balanced economic development.

In other words, the idea is to create a mixed economy. That is the purpo for instance, of the law on private local and foreign investments, also of t tax and customs reform, which enables the government to control forei trade, and of the nationalisation of banking.

The basic social and economic measures set out in the government's poli statement are being implemented in a complicated situation and are encount ing many difficulties. These are due chiefly to the rudimentary structure of t economy,[2] feudal forms of land tenure, lack of financial resources, ma illiteracy (90 per cent of the population), low efficiency of the administrati apparatus, and resistance from the big landowners and the reactionary clerg who still enjoy considerable influence. None the less the republican gover ment has carried out a number of progressive social measures: fixed worki hours, higher minimum wages, special food shops for workers, a ban female labour in mining, paid maternity leave, etc.

The recent meeting of the Grand Republican Assembly, the first since t overthrow of the monarchy, was an important event in the country's develo ment. It adopted Afghanistan's new constitution which emphasises the need strengthen the republican system, carry out deep-going social and econom reforms in the interests of the majority of the people, rejects all exploitati and proclaims social justice of democracy as a priority aim. The enactme of the Constitution is, beyond all doubt, a landmark in the process of nation renewal. Obviously, translating all the constitutional provisions into practi particularly democratisation of the country's life, will require unity a energetic effort by all who are concerned for Afghanistan's progress.

Real and Fake Friends

However, Afghanistan remains one of the world's most underdevelop countries (per capita income in March 1975-March 1976 was 4,085 afghan or a little less than $80). But economic development over the past few yea has been relatively good. The government is working on a seven-year econom and social development plan covering the period from 1977 to 1983, providi for capital investments of 170,000 million afghanis (about $3,300 million) Tl

plan lists 224 projects, including an oil refinery, a fertiliser plant, cannery, etc., of which 123 are to be begun this year. Much attention is being paid to agriculture, which is still the mainstay of the economy. The measures being carried out under the plan are aimed on the whole at setting up a developed national economy and at raising the people's living and cultural standards.

As in the past, the seven-year plan will be financed mainly by foreign aid, which last year was expected to account for more than 60 per cent of the budget. In recent years there has been a definite change in regard to loans from non-socialist countries. Last year they accounted for more than 50 per cent of all foreign aid (37.9 per cent in 1973), with Iran, Saudi Arabia and Kuwait contributing most of the aid from the non-socialist part of the world. The biggest capitalist donors were the United States, Federal Germany, France and Canada. Dependence on financial injections from these countries naturally complicates things for the new republic.

Imperialist "aid" to one or another country or region is governed entirely by the political and economic aims of the developed capitalist countries. For instance, the designation of US "aid" is determined by the general strategy of America's ruling circles, who want to retain the pattern of neocolonialist relations. The purpose of this strategy in Asia is to prevent the national-liberation movement from developing into social revolution, prevent the spread of scientific socialism, which is gaining support among the working people. This imperialist policy fully coincides with reactionary designs of the oil-rich Persian Gulf countries.

Afghanistan is increasingly becoming a target of this imperialist strategy. "Aid" from the United States, Iran and Saudi Arabia is meant to influence its economy and policy, strengthen the positions of its reactionary elements in their struggle against the progressive forces, retard the revolutionary process, create the conditions for the development of capitalist production relations, and thus keep Afghanistan within the capitalist orbit. To this end, financial and economic leverage is complemented by bribery, sabotage, plots, attempts to incite enmity between various ethnic groups. Imperialism and its allies in our region rely on the support of the reactionary clergy, the feudal land-owning element and part of the officer corps, which has been responsible for a number of plots against the republican regime.

The United States is anxious to strengthen its political, economic and military influence in Asian countries, convert them into a strategic NATO bridgehead, extend its military bases in the Indian Ocean and Persian Gulf, knock together new military blocs or dragoon more countries into the existing ones. Of late there have been intensified attempts to bring Afghanistan into the US-led CENTO bloc (which includes Britain, Turkey, Pakistan and Iran), the very existence of which is contrary to the spirit of our times.

The reactionary rulers of the Persian Gulf countries, working in conjunction with the imperialists, are trying to prevent positive social and economic trends in Afghanistan and hinder the development of its co-operation with the socialist countries. There are any number of facts to show that the largesse of the reactionary regimes in the oil-rich countries is motivated by a desire to "cut back Soviet influence", that is, isolate Afghanistan from its real friends and allies.

Most Asian countries are promoting friendly relations and fruitful co-operation with the Soviet Union, based on the principles of peaceful coexistence, equality, and respect for the sovereignty and independence of all states. Referring to the closer ties between the socialist and ex-colonial countries, Leonid Brezhnev, General Secretary of the CC CPSU, emphasised in his report to the 25th Party Congress: "Our Party supports and will continue to support peoples fighting for their freedom. In so doing the Soviet Union does not look for advantages, does not hunt for concession, does not seek political domination and is not after military bases. We act as we are bid by our revolutionary conscience, our Communist convictions."

That is fully borne out by the fifty years of Soviet-Afghani co-operation. The USSR was the first to recognise independent Afghanistan, and the first to recognise the new republican government. There are stable, mutually advantageous and long-term economic ties between the two countries. Soviet economic and financial assistance has helped Afghanistan build 67 enterprises in various branches of the economy, with many more now under construction. In 1975 factories built with Soviet assistance produced more than three-fifths of the industrial output of the state sector. Relations between the two countries will be given fresh impetus by the economic co-operation treaty signed in Moscow on April 14, 1977.

Furthermore, industries built with Soviet assistance not only produce for the home market but have a guaranteed market in the Soviet Union. This applies, in particular, to the development, with Soviet aid, of natural gas. Besides being a good way of repaying Soviet credits, this boosts economic development. There is also this major consideration: enterprises built with Soviet assistance strengthen the state sector and create the pre-conditions for continued industrialisation in line with the national development programme.

The capitalist countries usually stipulates that their "aid" be used for development of a certain approved industry, and, very often, that the work be done by an approved contractor. And this in addition to the various political strings attached.

Despite all the attempts by imperialist circles, all patriotic forces favour continued friendship and co-operation with the USSR and other socialist countries. The steady growth of socialism's strength, the high international prestige and active peace policy of the Soviet Union, have firmly asserted the principle of peaceful coexistence in international relations. And, of course, durable peace is essential for the successful growth and spread of the liberation movement in all its various aspects. The socialist countries are in the van of the worldwide struggle for peace, for an end to the arms race and for disarmament, which would create the most favourable conditions for resolving social and economic problems and consolidating the political and economic independence of developing countries.

Goals of Progressive Development

Afghanistan's progressive and revolutionary forces are faced with the complex task of countering imperialist pressure and foiling the plans of the still active and influential internal reactionary forces in order to forge ahead to social and economic progress and genuine democracy.

The most formidable problem is agriculture. Under the monarchy, 40,000 landowners, that is about 2.1 per cent of the rural population, possessed 70 per cent of the most fertile lands, whereas 1,460,000 peasant families had only 30 per cent. The land reform law promulgated in the summer of 1975 called for a fundamental restructuring of the rural economy. But only the first, very timid steps were taken. The government was reluctant to encroach on the privileges of the landowners and began by distributing state lands among nomad and landless peasants. Slightly more than 11 thousand hectares were distributed among 7,000 peasant families between January 1974 and March 1976. Prior to 1973, there were nearly 380,000 peasants without any land and another 300,000 with tiny plots. So a considerable part of the rural population is still landless. That is why the progressive forces are demanding radical refashioning of agrarian relations as the most urgent task facing the country.

There is a lively debate on how to overcome economic backwardness and the multi-formation structure of the economy, how to assure a decisive role for the state and co-operative sectors and refashion economic and other relations with developed capitalist countries on the basis of equality and non-interference in internal affairs.

The main directions of the fight to strengthen national independence and achieve economic emancipation and, what is especially important, unity of all the progressive forces, are now taking shape. In the opinion of Afghanistan's progressives, the country should follow a course designed to strengthen the state sector, but with due account to the interests of the people and with their active participation in economic management. This is the only effective answer to the selfish policies of imperialism and the republic's enemies at home and abroad.

The patriotic forces also believe that the liberation struggle imperatively demands systematic exposure of the subversive activities of imperialism and its reactionary helpers at home. These activities are designed to weaken the ties of friendship and co-operation with the socialist community and the peoples of the Soviet Union. And they have to be not only exposed, but effectively countered. Another goal is democratisation of public life and the provision of conditions for the country's continuous advance. That is the sure basis for genuine independence.

We know from experience that accomplishment of the urgent tasks of the national liberation movement in developing countries depends on unity of all its revolutionary, anti-imperialist contingents. This makes it possible to bring the working people into political, economic and social activity. United action is equally important for an effective rebuff to the imperialist onslaught on the people's gains. Such unity is all the more necessary today when the imperialist forces and internal reaction are using every available opportunity to incite discord among the progressive forces, exploiting every difference between them to weaken and discredit the national-democratic movement as a whole. Analysis of all these problems has led Afghani patriots to the conclusion that their common interests and aspirations provide an adequate and durable basis for united action, which, in turn, is the earnest of success in the battle for progress, democracy and peace.

[1] Elected President in February 1977.

footnotes continued

[2] According to available data, agriculture accounts for about 50 per cent and industry for 20 per cent of GNP. There are about 200 factory-type enterprises, employing 40,000 workers, with another 200,000 in cottage industry; 75 per cent of the gainfully employed population are engaged in agriculture.

Social Problems of the Cities and Communist Policy

International Seminar

THIS was the theme of an international seminar in Prague sponsored by *WMR*. The seminar was attended by **Ruth Kessler,** Chairman of the City Planning Committee, Dresden, GDR; Professor **Dieter Hösel** of the Academy of Socio-Political Sciences and Law, GDR; **Giancarlo Quagliotti,** leader of the Communist group in the municipality of Turin, Italy; **Renzo Ciaiolo,** leader of the Communist group in the municipality of Bossoleno, Italy, **Nikolai Yablokov,** Chairman, Executive Committee of the City Soviet of Yaroslavl, Soviet Union; **Dmitry Bruns,** Chief Architect of Tallinn, Soviet Union; **Taisto Johteinen,** Mayor of Kemi, Finland; **Marcel Rosette,** CC member, French CP;[1] **Zdenek Zuska,** Mayor of Prague, Czechoslovakia, and **Vaclav Kasalicky,** Director, Institute of Architecture, Prague, as well as by members of the *WMR* commission on general theoretical problems.

The items offered for discussion were: the nature and distinctive aspects of the social problems of cities under the two opposed social systems; the place of municipal authorities in the structure of state power and their possibilities of materialising the working people's social, economic and political interests, problems and possibilities of urbanisation control under capitalism and socialism: the main lines of Communist activity in the urban sphere in socialist and capitalist countries.

Component of the Struggle Against Monopoly

The evolution of capitalist society is closely linked with the growth of cities, the concentration of the working class in them, and its growing class consciousness and organisation. Lenin defined the cities as "centres of the economic, political and spiritual life of the people and . . . the chief vehicles of progress" (Lenin, *Coll. Works*, Vol. 19, p. 270). Capitalist cities have always been the focus of the insoluble social contradictions of bourgeois society. What is today's capitalist city socially? What new aspects do relations between classes and between social groups show on the urban scene and how does Communist policy take them into account?

The profound transformation of Italian society that has been going on ever since the end of World War II as a process stimulated by the political and social struggles of the working class and other popular strata, said Renzo

Chiolo, involves rapid growth of the cities. Millions of people lacking adequate qualifications and proper housing have flocked to the cities. Those who have been able to secure a home are compelled to pay a huge part of their wages in rent, some as much as half of them. The average standard of school construction, medical care and other services is very modest. Urbanisation has been accompanied by the economic decline and impoverishment of numerous cities. The traditional imbalance between North and South has increased and large agricultural areas of the South have become desolate. By contrast, the parasitical strata have become richer still. Thousands upon thousands of millions of lire are paid annually in urban rent. The big industrialists and monopolists have a vast reserve of workers who are willing to work for wages far below the subsistence minimum.

The workers have never been inactive or weak in the face of these phenomena. Led by the Communist Party and other democratic organisations, they have rallied together to resist monopoly pressures and have put their stamp on national development, on urban politics, culture and public life generally.

The growth of new urban strata is an important characteristic of the social environment of today's capitalist cities, said **Giancarlo Quagliotti**. The ICP, while promoting the traditional worker-peasant alliance, works steadfastly to unite other popular strata behind the working class. In this way we isolate and curtail the interests of big monopoly capital, of all who are connected with the parasitical strata; we also alter a situation in which elementary modern amenities are lacking. Relations between diverse sections of the urban population are a reflection of the conflict between forces with opposed economic and political interests. In common with other political forces, Communists as leaders of local government bodies or as a political opposition have always been uncompromising antagonists of the capitalist system. They have raised cardinal problems of the struggle for a new urbanism and revealed the social character of these problems.

A bitter struggle is going on for planned development, a struggle to ensure that urbanisation serves the public interest and to balance the country's territorial organisation and economic development. We also campaign for a housing policy that will make it possible to solve the problem as a social one, for an end to real-estate speculation, for the transformation of schools into an instrument of a new culture, for the reorganisation of transport, for medical services that will be within everyone's reach. This campaign was spurred by the gains of the Communists and other democrats in the June 1976 municipal elections. At present 25 million Italians are living in municipalities governed by Communists; Communists head the municipalities of Turin, Naples, Florence and many other big cities.

Quagliotti told about some achievements of the Turin municipality and other Communist-led urban self-government bodies in improving the working people's life. He pointed out that the democratic forces had dealt a telling blow at the parasitical, speculative use of urban land.

The housing crisis, the disorderly development of some components of the urban system, lack of sanitation, crime, unemployment and many other aspects of urban life to which Engels called attention over a hundred years ago exist

today on a still larger scale and in sharper forms, participants in the seminar pointed out. The housing crisis, **Marcel Rosette** says in his paper, is particularly intolerable. It affects not only the working class but specialists and white-collar workers, who ensure the development of cities but have no share in decision-making on its character. Those who may be said to be living in unsatisfactory conditions include 75,000 slum dwellers, 2,700,000 families whose homes lack running water or are tumbledown dwellings and 4,900,000 people living in overcrowded dwellings. And now unhealthy living conditions and overcrowding are aggravated by new forms of social poverty. Skyrocketing rents and rates of interest on loans for the construction or purchase of homes are compounded by growing charges for public services. These expenditures prove too heavy for the family budget and arrears of rent assume alarming proportions. As a result, the property of families is sequestrated and they are evicted by the police with official authorisation. Numerous families cannot afford gas or electricity. The critical housing situation is made worse by a shortage or complete lack of cultural and other public establishments and by destruction of the environment.

All non-monopoly strata are hit, if to varying degrees, by the urbanisation crisis. More and more often, actions by various urban population groups are directed against monopoly power and the state subservient to it. The state tries to use urban development policy as a means of dividing the non-monopoly urban strata and inspiring the less exploited of them with reformist illusions. The growing length of daily trips has extended the working day and led to a certain slowing down of struggles at local level. But owing to the worsening crisis, the FCP's explanatory work, actions launched on its initiative or with its participation, and the special role of Communist-led municipalities, the means used by the government to block action by the urban strata and prevent their merger in one stream prove less and less effective. No matter who initiates action, the Party helps in decisive measure to direct it against those really responsible for the situation by spelling out the existing alternative and the reasons why all non-monopoly sectors have a stake in the action. In this way the Party bars the spread of reformist ideas ("change the city to change life") among the people and helps to increase popular commitment to this struggle. The growing crisis, various imbalances and deformations caused by monopoly urbanisation in spite of efforts at communal level to meet the basic requirements of the population have stimulated FCP efforts to evolve a national approach to the modernisation of urban areas, a policy towards urbanisation and, in a broader context, towards living conditions. Tasks for the subsequent period were specified in the Party's programme "For a Democratic Government of Popular Unity" (1971). Afterwards many of these tasks were included in the joint government programme of three left-wing parties.

Urbanisation poses problems not only in large communities but where the population is decreasing, said **Taisto Johteinen.** This decrease is most marked in the north and east of Finland. Where the population is on the decline, its social composition is becoming deformed. Specifically, there is an increase in the proportion of aged people and a drop in the birth rate; incomes and purchasing capacity are lagging more and more in comparison with other regions and, besides, a low level of consumption hampers industrial activity

At the same time, the revenues which the communes get in the form of taxes are falling off, with the result that opportunities for investment in school construction, transport, housing, and so on are substantially reduced. As the working people of town and countryside want a change in the monopoly trend of urbanisation, the Communists of Finland have always regarded the struggle to solve social problems of the cities on democratic lines as an essential component of the struggle against monopoly.

The Communist Party of Finland has gained considerable experience in the effort aimed at transforming local self-government bodies into strongholds of the anti-monopoly struggle of the working class and its allies. Although the communes have very limited freedom of action as self-governing entities, they are still in a position to adopt measures at variance with those of government agencies, above all by exercising their right to levy taxes. The Finnish working-class movement has always favoured greater communal democracy. It was largely due to the Communists' years-long campaign that late in 1976 a bill extending communal self-government was submitted to parliament.

The democratic forces of Italy, said Ciaiolo, have always seen local autonomy as a strategic goal of the struggle to free the people. Italian communes have never been a purely administrative problem but a political one as well. They play an important part in the struggle for greater democracy, a new economic and social model for the country and new international relations. The communes' role is particularly great now, due above all to the pressing need of a substantial change in the nature and structure of state power. By increasing the role and powers of a state apparatus serving the interests of the big bourgeoisie, the Christian Democratic Party has imposed on the country an entirely adverse course of development leading to mismanagement and a waste of national resources. This course could only be pursued by simultaneously reducing the possibilities of local government bodies.

Yet the very nature of the communes, where popular influence is strong, demands that the emphasis be put on meeting the requirements of the people by encouraging social, collective consumption. The communes are in the forefront of the movement for democratic programming and for a close co-ordination of national and local plans, so that local bodies may be able to join in choosing and working out the main lines of development and in supervising the execution of plans. In Italy, the aims of a democratic reform can only be achieved by launching a vast mass movement and defeating the resistance of conservatives. The communes are a key channel for the formation and operation of a mass political movement. They have demonstrated their tremendous potential in bringing about democratic changes, extending the people's rights and setting up a durable system of alliances between the working class and other exploited classes and strata.

A growing financial debt is one of the greatest problems facing capitalist cities, said **Nikolai Yablokov.** Can it be radically and democratically solved by increasing communal autonomy, without altering the class nature of the national authority? It seems to me that to emphasise activity at municipal level rather than the attitude to the state and the struggle to change the social, economic and political structures of society is like trying to fell a tree by

lopping off its branches. In general, can the bourgeois state grant the com-munes, especially those governed by Communists, the financial and material resources needed for the solution of social problems of the cities? If so, at whose expense?

First of all, Ciaiolo replied, the ICP insists that the state assume the com munes' entire debt and pay it off in forty years. The Party also insists on changing the tax system to make the rich pay higher taxes. It is a scandal tha thousands of rich people still dodge taxes every year by using various trick and loopholes. It is essential to introduce a fundamentally new pattern of ta distribution between the state and the communes. While the scope of com munal activity has grown, the communes only get 11 per cent of all ta receipts, and surely this is wrong. Why, they got 23 per cent even under th fascist dictatorship. It is important to find a solution ensuring greater involve ment of the masses, making it possible to take account of the interests of a communes and combining their efforts and resources.

The role of municipal bodies under state-monopoly capitalism is con tradictory, according to Rosette. On the one hand, the communes are a appendage of the state apparatus, an institution enabling the bourgeoisie t tighten its hold on the working people. On the other hand, the effort to adap communal structures to monopoly requirements comes up against the fact tha the communes want to retain the relative autonomy they were granted earlie within the framework of bourgeois democracy, and that they remain to degree traditional centres of democratic activity. For years, Communis elected to diverse bodies have refused to support the authorities' strateg towards urbanisation and other issues. They have taken numerous initiative to develop a movement of the population and enhance the democrat character of communal government in both framing urban policy and meetin immediate demands. We invite the French to fight in common with us for th preservation of jobs and the creation of new ones, in support of trade and th handicrafts, for more vigorous development of social and cultural institution for everyone to have a guaranteed right to a home, for the state to do its dut by financing social construction and cutting rent, for cheaper and more up-to date public transport, against environmental pollution. We realise, howeve that judicious urbanism and a durable improvement of living conditions an the habitat are impossible without far-reaching changes, without a change (policy, of power, of society.

In campaigning for more democratic local government and raising th problem to the stature of a national one, we do not confine the issue to th management of spheres of secondary importance, said Ciaiolo. We strive t use the mechanism of government interference in the economy as a means c introducing into the country's social and economic structures element antagonistic to the nature of imperialism. Ours is not a reformist policy. I local self-government bodies in which they have a majority, the Communist make a choice aimed at meeting people's everyday requirements and link u the solution of problems with more general plans to transform the econom and society as a whole. We make a point of safeguarding and extending th people's democratic gains, which are primarily a result of working-clas struggles. This is bound to produce new contradictions in the mechanisms o

capitalist society. Democracy is the basis on which the working-class shapes and builds up its ability to govern the country in alliance with other forces.

The ruling quarters, it was pointed out at the seminar, counter the Communists' aspiration to thoroughly change the nature of state power and put an end to monopoly domination with the policy and ideology of state monopoly regulation of urbanisation processes. What are the limitations and contradictory aspects of this regulation?

In capitalist society, said Johteinen, the possibility of controlling urbanisation depends largely on the possibility of regulating investment. Until recently, most government measures were restricted to consulting firms and granting them loans. At present certain efforts are being made to extend the forms and methods of state monopoly regulation of investment. Whether they will have an effect on the distribution of production facilities, the creation of more jobs, and so on, is a topic of lively discussion in Finland. The Communists join in this discussion and stress that the prerequisites of controlling and regulating urbanisation and planned social development generally are created only where society controls investment, which, in turn, implies far-reaching social changes. The need to transform urbanisation from a spontaneous into a regulated process is growing. We see this as a further argument in favour of the socialist perspective championed by the Communists, by all democrats.

The limitations of state monopoly regulation of urbanisation processes, Rosette notes, are due to the structure-forming factors in today's social organisation of capitalist society. Prominent among these are two elements: the big enterprises as production and economic management organisations corresponding to concentration of capital and means of production, and the state, which interferes more and more in economic activity and public life generally, thereby becoming their "organiser" and playing the role of "manager" of sectors that, being indispensable to production, yield a rate of profit seen as inadequate by the monopolies. The balance of the urbanistic system depends on how far the production process and the process of reproducing public life are interconnected. The logic of a balanced urbanistic system calls for organisation according to the logic of reproducing the work force to the detriment of the special interests of capital. Government interference under capitalism is not neutral. It is not conditioned by the objectives of rationalising the urbanistic system but by the nature of the machinery itself, and is effected with due regard to latent interests existing in this or that industry and at every level, to their relationship with the class struggle and the political situation. Hence the contradictions and crises and, most important, the dovetailing of urbanisation policy with the overall policy of the bourgeois state, with all ensuing consequences. The political objectives of managing the urbanistic system are such that the state apparatus is compelled not only to interfere sporadically, aggravating the contradictions of the system, but to disguise its inability to keep its hold on urban development and remove the contradictions of capitalist urbanisation.

Socialism Offers Solutions in the People's Interests

Being based on public ownership of the means of production and genuine democracy, socialism fundamentally changes the very nature of social problems and adds a new dimension to Communist municipal activities. In socialist

society, speakers pointed out, the priority problem is to manage urbanisation in a way that will raise prosperity levels. The centerpiece of urban management is planning.

All the questions involved in the development of a city as a single harmonious entity, **Dmitry Bruns** said, are covered by the city's general development plan. Drawn up on the instructions of the city Soviet, it covers a period of twenty to twenty-five years, specifying the lines of urban development, the volume and location of housing and industrial areas, expansion of transport, services, educational, medical, cultural, sports and research facilities, and environmental protection measures. All this work is carried out in stages, according to fixed time-tables. The general plan also makes provisions for the expansion of the water supply, the sewerage system, electric power, etc. The city Soviet decides on the main targets of the general plan and on the basic data needed for its formulation. The plan is a result of collective effort by demographers, sociologists, architects, engineers, transport experts and other specialists.

Bruns described how this work out in Tallinn, the capital of Soviet Estonia, how the acute social problems left over from the bourgeois days and World War II were solved. Socialist rebuilding began with restoring the city's industrial potential and creating new industrial districts. This was part of a long-range plan. Today the city's industries produce nearly 40 times more than before the war. New industrial areas have come into being—they are located in specially designated zones. This solved one of the biggest social and town-planning problems, namely, providing transport and other facilities for thousands of workers. It also solved another important social problem, adequate housing for the people of Tallinn. Once industry had been rebuilt and industrial building methods introduced, housing construction was begun on a large scale. Thus, between 1956 and 1976 it increased by 330 per cent, which meant increasing the average per capita floor space to 15.1 square metres. It also meant ridding the city of many of its old, sub-standard houses and moving the people who lived in them into new, modern flats. This was a formidable task and in the past 30 years we have virtually added three new cities to the old Tallinn. And as our economic potential continues to increase, we are shifting to a new and better type of house, with every housing area provided with kindergartens, schools, shops, hospitals, and so on. The very nature of socialism creates favourable conditions for the planned, harmonious solution of urban problems, enabling us to avoid the negative phenomena characteristic of capitalist cities. For instance, our cities do not have to worry about financial crises. Under the current five-year plan, Tallinn is spending 1,000m roubles, or nearly 200m roubles more than under the previous five-year plan, on building new cultural and other facilities.

Experience has shown, **Harry Jones** (South African Communist Party) remarked, that problems arise even when urban development follows a definite plan. Does this not mean that restructuring a country's economy according to plan does not assure full solution of all urban social problems?

All the achievements of Soviet society, Bruns replied, including the solution of urban problems, are closely tied in with planning. Socialism is never content with what it has achieved. It searches for new, more effective ways and

neans of solving social problems. The 25th CPSU Congress emphasised that ur society must raise the standard of planning, bring it into line with the new cale, character and requirements of our economy. At the present stage of uilding communism, it is extremely important to take a comprehensive pproach to our long-range problems, to see economic and social problems in heir unity. This means that we must solve our urban problems through socio-conomic planning, by applying planning methods and systematic regulation o those aspects of city life which in the past were not adequately covered by he general plan. Formerly, the general plan was chiefly confined to town lanning and took little account of the changing social structure of the city, f people's way of life. This made it necessary to find a comprehensive pproach to economic and social problems. We now do that by evolving ocio-economic development plans for our urban communities.

The thesis that socio-economic planning is the key to solving the basic roblems of socialist cities was supported by other speakers from the socialist ountries. In the initial stages of socialist construction, **Zdenek Zuska** said, lanning was confined mainly to material production. But even then economic lanning was a powerful factor in solving urban social problems, including the roblem of overcoming the anti-social attributes of city life inherited from he capitalist system, and it has been solved in our country. In the capitalist vorld urban development, "spurred" by the drive for profit, leads to social egregation and millions of people are compelled to live in overcrowded or lilapidated dwellings even though there are numerous vacant flats (press eports set the number of such flats at 1.5 million in France alone). By contrast, socialism has put an end to the division of the city into rich and poor listricts, with the quality of housing depending on the tenants' income, the harp difference between the centre and outlying districts, and the health azards caused by a chaotic distribution of industry and the services.

Building developed socialism makes much higher demands on the theory nd practice of planning, which is now characterised by a comprehensive pproach, long-range planning and emphasis on the social aspects of town lanning. Comprehensive socio-economic planning was initiated by the working people themselves and extended at first to only some of the factories, but fterwards it came to involve larger units, and experience has shown that nany problems can only be solved by these larger units. A new stage was eached when long-range socio-economic planning was extended to larger erritorial units, districts and cities.

Like other socialist cities, the Czechoslovak capital has its long-term socio-conomic programme, drawn up under the direction of the Central and City arty Committees. It is based on the city's general plan and is intended to o-ordinate the political, economic, social, territorial, technical and investment lements of Prague's development up to 1990, with a more detailed programme for the present, sixth five-year plan (1976-1980). It also contains uidelines for the city's development over a longer period, up to the year 000, with industrial expansion tied in with municipal development, the vailability of labour and material resources, housing requirements, in public ducation and health and social maintenance.

Our comprehensive development programmes, Yablokov said, are based on

Party and government decisions and the economic development plan. Th
25th CPSU Congress decisions outline the overall aims of our social develop
ment and indicate the ways and means of attaining them. The job of municipa
agencies is to find the most advisable methods of implementing their part o
these plans, with due regard to local conditions.

Their chief aim is to make urban development a means of heightenin
prosperity standards, facilitate the all-round development of the individua
and equalise social and economic conditions of the various population group
The primary consideration here is expansion in housing and municipa
services. The social and economic development plan for Yaroslavl for th
current, tenth five-year plan (1976-1980; it was drafted under the guidance o
the city Party organisation) provides for the construction of about 1,600,0C
square metres of new housing. The accent now, in line with the 25th Congres
decisions, is on better housing and on simultaneous construction of hous
and cultural and other establishments, providing more effective municipa
services, modernising the city and improving it architecturally.

All our plans, the speaker added, are based on scientific knowledge of th
social structure of socialist cities and the social processes taking place in ther
Priority is given to measures designed to heighten the role of the workir
class, both in the production sphere and in public affairs, and to continue
improvement of vocational training for the younger generation of worker
Nowadays the production process depends in large measure on the workir
people's ability to achieve higher efficiency in production and improve soci
structures. But that is possible only if society brings all the achievements o
science and culture within the reach of the entire population and assures th
all-round development of the individual. In our city (population 571,000) w
have established a steadily expanding system of institutions that help raise th
cultural level and skills of our working people. New workers are recruite
exclusively from our system of vocational training in which young people, a
well as learning a profession, receive a complete secondary education. Ther
are 17 such schools, and their students get free meals, living quarters, uniform
and working clothes, in addition to regular grants. There are also four highe
educational establishments with a student body of 25,000, 80 general schoo
with an attendance of 75,000 and kindergartens and day nurseries accom
modating 45,000. The city has its drama theatre, philharmonic, circus an
puppet theatre, 50 public halls, including 11 cinema theatres, and 30 house
of culture offering a wide range of facilities that help our people to develo
their abilities.

Replying to a question by **Sergio Sierra,** Central Committee member of th
Communist Party of Uruguay, Yablokov explained in detail how the munici
pal agencies in his city look after the health of the people and how physica
education of children is organised in the Soviet Union. Health care an
physical education of the rising generation in the Soviet Union are seen as a
matter of state significance, he said. Every form of medical care and all sport
facilities are provided free of charge. Yaroslavl has over 10,000 medica
workers. Its major enterprises have holiday and health homes in the suburbs
The city also has 12 sports schools for children.

Low rent is a salient feature of socialist cities, said **Ruth Kessler.** In the

capitalist countries, many working people have to spend up to half of their wages on rent. In Dresden, however, rent claims only about 5 per cent of the family income. Industrial and construction enterprises play an important part in improving working and living conditions. Their role in solving urban problems has grown noticeably in recent years. Once it was held that to improve living conditions in the cities was a function of the municipal authorities and did not concern the enterprises. But now enterprises situated within city limits help to solve a growing number of urban problems, such as extending housing construction, modernising old houses, providing more nurseries and kindergartens or building cultural and other public establishments. The clubhouses, sports facilities and libraries built by enterprises are put at the disposal of the entire population of the city.

Kessler also told about some of the important elements of the socio-economic development plan of Dresden, notably housing construction, public health, assistance to women workers and large families, environmental protection and expansion of recreational amenities. She emphasised the importance of accurately forecasting population growth to plan housing construction and expansion of municipal, medical, educational and cultural services.

Kessler was asked a number of questions, in particular about plan provisions for the interests and requirements of the different population groups, especially the musical interests of its young people (question by Harry Jones), the requirements of motorists (question by **Jeronimo Carrera**, CC member, CP Venezuela). She replied that the cultural plan makes adequate provisions for every aspect of culture—folk, classical, modern. Dresden is a major cultural centre, and the city authorities do much to meet the cultural requirements of young people. For instance, the city Palace of Culture, with a hall seating 2,500, arranges not only concerts of classical music, but also performances by vocal and instrumental groups and jazz bands, social evenings, and so on. Besides, there are a number of youth cafes with floor shows. All our restaurants and cafes arrange weekly social evenings. As for the motorists, we have made allocations for the maintenance of existing repair shops, petrol pumps, and other facilities, and for the provision of new ones.

It is generally conceded, **Dieter Hösel** remarked, that the socialist countries are successfully coping with the social problems of cities. But there are still many unsolved problems, and we never try to conceal them. In the GDR, not everyone in our major and medium-sized cities has adequate housing in terms of size and modern facilities. In the bigger towns, kindergarten and day-nursery accommodation is still a problem. The important thing, however, is that all these problems are being solved, and the time is not far off when they will be solved. The SUPG programme calls for complete solution of the housing problem, which will mean a modern flat for each family by 1990, and the problem of child-care facilities will be solved even before that.

The speaker was asked by Quagliotti whether the high degree of urbanisation in the GDR has not resulted in the emergence of communities or small towns whose development is considerably behind that of the country as a whole.

The answer was that the GDR has no regional problems similar to those in the capitalist countries. Urbanisation follows a definite plan covering all com-

munities, big and small, though, of course, growth rates have not always been the same. The medium-sized towns are developing at a faster pace because they provide optimal conditions for new industries and development of the infrastructure and offer congenial working and living conditions. Nor do we have the capitalist-type contradictions between the towns and agricultural areas. This is because, first, there are no substantial differences in pay, living and general conditions between the two, second, intensive agricultural development rules out the emergence of "backward", "no-future" areas, and lastly every hectare of farmland is cultivated.

In present-day conditions the accent is on the quality of our towns (scientific production, cultural, educational, social and other facilities), **Vaclav Kasalicky** said. Accordingly, our urbanisation policy does not simply reproduce the traditional pattern of populated communities but systematically promotes new patterns with higher socio-economic and cultural indicators. Socialist urbanisation has, along with architecture, become a science and art. We undertake projects unknown in the past. Even formulation of our problems involves scientific and artistic elements, and their solution requires intensive research and proper aesthetic taste. This is all the more important because our future way of life cannot be simply a projection of the present way of life. What we town planners lack is, so to say, information of what the socialist way of life will be at the beginning of the twenty-first century, at a time when the housing estates and other projects we are now designing will be functioning. This involves many problems, and not so much in housing construction as in complementary projects that make residential areas more than simply a habitat. The way of life in developed socialist society already confronts us with demands that go beyond the customary components of town planning. This applies, for instance, to the development of trade and service facilities enabling every city dweller fully to enjoy the benefits of culture. It is an open secret that often our city dwellers take a one-sided, consumer approach to culture assimilating its external attributes rather than its substance.

A number of speakers discussed the relation between municipal authorities and the national government in socialist society. We regard the city authorities, **Zuska** said, as a key component of one system of state power, their function being to carry out on their own particular territory the policy of the Communist Party and the socialist state. The character and mechanism of relations between the two rests on Marxist-Leninist political and legal concepts relating to the organisation and functioning of government agencies and social management institutions. The leading role of the Communist Party, democratic centralism, worker participation in running the state, socialist legality, equality of nations and nationalities, are all fundamental principles of socialist government.

The primary function of the Prague National Committee as an organ of state power and city government is to assure the all-round development of the city through planned construction, expansion and modernisation of transport and other services, development of cultural and public life, protection of the people's health and of the environment, preservation of cultural and historical monuments and maintenance of public order. The Communist Party Central Committee and the Czechoslovak government do much to help the city

authorities cope with the many problems involved in developing Prague. Ministries and other central government departments closely co-operate with our National Committee in building up the capital and in solving its economic, cultural, health and other problems. The municipal authorities at all levels, the government and other government bodies always bear in mind that the development of Prague's economic and cultural potential has an important bearing on the entire country.

Yablokov discussed measures taken by municipal authorities to improve working and living conditions. Much has been accomplished in this respect in recent years, he said. Addressing the 25th Party Congress, Leonid Brezhnev remarked that due to the attention which the Party devotes to problems of building up the state, "the work of local Soviets has now acquired a new dimension". City Soviets are empowered to co-ordinate and control the work of all industrial and other enterprises on their territory in such matters as housing construction, cultural and general amenities and all the many other factors that go into providing normal working conditions. In particular, enterprises and organisations that build housing on their own must put part of the housing they build at the disposal of the city Soviet. On the whole, however, the population's requirements are met in any Soviet city by contributions to the city budget out of the profits of industrial, building, transport and other enterprises. They exceed 90 per cent of the city's revenue, with less than 10 per cent coming from taxes and rents.

Question by **Alberto Kohen,** representative of the CP Argentina: While the nature and status of municipal authorities in the socialist countries are different, does that not lead, nevertheless, to contradictions between local and central organs similar to those described here by speakers from capitalist countries?

In the socialist countries, Yablokov replied, these relations are based on entirely new principles. Authorities at all levels are guided by common aims. Every decision by the central authorities accords with the interests of the people. Hence, counterposing the central leadership to the municipal authorities in a socialist society would only lead to undesirable consequences detrimental to the interests of the cities and their populations. The purpose of managing urbanisation is to find an approach and methods which resolve some concrete problem and at the same time provide optimal conditions for the progress of society as a whole. Where municipal organs cannot cope with a problem for lack of requisite resources and powers, they refer the matter to a higher government agency to secure its assistance.

The right of municipal organs to control expenditure by industrial enterprises and organisations on housing, cultural and other facilities, Bruns emphasised, combines the interests of individual factories and offices with the interests of the city as an integrated and complex social, economic and territorial entity. Private property in real estate has been abolished in socialist cities, which affords the municipal authorities far greater opportunities to make more judicious use of the urban area than can be done in a capitalist city The city Soviet is full master of all the territory under its jurisdiction. It alone can allocate land for use by state, co-operative and public organisations or private persons. And it exerts considerable influence on the character,

design and construction of all projects on this territory. If, say, it is a matter of starting a new factory, the city Soviet determines where and how it should be built so as to conform with the city's growing requirements. The city Soviet also rules on measures to protect the environment (waste-disposal techniques, etc.), determines the size of the canteen to be built at the expense of the factory, the number of flats needed by its workers, and so on. The plans for every new construction project have to be cleared with the local Soviet. But its authority does not end there: every new building has to be examined and approved by a government commission of which a representative of the city Soviet is either chairman or a member. In short, the Soviet has the last say on all matters relating to the city's development.

Work Among the Urban Masses

What are the most effective forms of political organisation of the working people that help to consolidate the unity and organisation of the working class and attract to it all the progressive forces of society? What opportunities and forms are there for worker participation in managing city affairs in socialist and capitalist countries?

The entire political system of real socialism, Hösel pointed out, helps to unite the workers under the leadership of the Communist Party in building the new society. The socialist revolution initiates the process of removing social antagonisms between urban strata. Growing social and political unity of society as a whole is becoming the dominant trend of their evolution, a trend that is intensifying as socialism attains an ever higher degree of maturity. The socialist state is the working people's principal instrument in building a developed socialist society while the GDR National Front functions as the political form of interaction of all urban strata. The Front comprises the SUPG, another four parties and mass organisations of the working class and other working people: the Free German Trade Unions, youth and women's organisations, and cultural unions. All the democratic parties and mass organisations united in the National Front are represented in all elected bodies. The guiding force, the organisational and political centre of this system, is the SUPG, which leads the activity of all the components of the political system of real socialism. The working-class party exercises its leading role in the cities through its groups in municipal and mass organisations and its branches, which organise the masses to implement to the Party's political, social and economic strategy.

The most effective form of political organisation in capitalist conditions is the Party branch, as Rosette sees it. It can initiate and organise mass action on particular and general municipal issues, and impart purpose and direction to campaigns begun by other organisations. It can do this either directly or through its activists in mass organisations or local associations. The latter vary in character and can therefore influence different social groups, and promote a variety of initiatives and actions. The neighbourhood committees are instrumental in analysing municipal problems and action on them. They also play a role by assisting the municipalities and keeping a "public eye" on their activities. Communist-led municipalities combine their functions with political activity. Unlike right-wing municipalities, which conceal their true

ims behind a smokescreen of apolitical talk (as if municipal government did ot involve politics!), the Communists make it their business to reveal the eal obstacles to satisfying the people's needs and to the city's harmonious rowth. By their actions and achievements, especially on tax issues, Communist-led municipalities help to merge public actions in a concerted effort gainst those responsible for the city's ills. They pursue policies calculated to revent, not invite, financial crisis.

In Italy, Quagliotti said, monopoly capital is trying to maintain control in he municipalities. The monopolists and the rentiers have for many years been vorking within a broad alliance, bent on maximising profits from the exploitaion of our land and people. At local level, this finds expression in weak and orrupt city administrations that look after private rather than public interests.

Growing social contradictions due to organisation and the increasing olitical awareness of the masses have weakened this alliance, dominated by Big Business. The ties binding together these disparate social forces, including section of the working people, have been gradually but steadily loosening. This has influenced the attitude of the political parties. That was the situation n the many municipalities which campaigned for an end to a bankrupt policy. Ve believe that the best way to combat the conservative Christian Democratic orces is to isolate them and increase our influence on the social strata on vhich they lean for support. Our aim is maximum unity of the democratic orces and parties as an indispensable factor in achieving broad agreement to ave the way to vitally needed economic and other fundamental changes. ccordingly, the Italian Communist Party has worked out organisational rms of uniting organisations of diverse political, ideological and cultural ientation.

Question by Kohen: What organisational forms were employed in Turin to ite the people around the Communist Party and other left forces?

Turin, one of Europe's biggest industrial centres, has strong proletarian and nternationalist traditions and a strong Party organisation, Quagliotti replied. n the last elections, the Communists obtained 40 per cent of the vote and a Communist was elected mayor. The city's Party organisation has 40,000 nembers, with 200,000 workers belonging to the trade unions, 50,000 to Communist-led democratic sports and cultural organisations, and 20,000 rtisans and small businessmen belonging to anti-monopoly co-operatives. To his should be added the Democratic Women's Organisation and other Communist-led unity associations and committees. They include, for example, eighbourhood committees active on issues vital to the people of the given rea. Then there are hundreds of factory councils, made up of workers of ifferent political affiliations—Communists, Socialists, Catholics. Nearly every igher educational establishment has its students' union. This organisational nfrastructure is the reply of the democratic forces to the degradation of our ities resulting from uncontrolled urbanisation.

The municipalities, Johteinen said, are one of the channels of Communist ontact with the masses. Through them the Communists can reach large ections of the people and uphold their interests not only on the shop floor, ut also, and primarily, at their places of residence. In a certain sense, nunicipal bodies, in particular the city government, not only champion the

interests of the working people, but are a very effective school of management for fairly large sections of the working people.

Question by Bruns: How can the municipalities serve as a school of management of public affairs in a bourgeois country?

In Finland, Johteinen replied, local government is based on a system of delegates, of whom there are about 30,000 in 63 cities and 22 suburbs, and of this number about 3,000 are active in city councils and another 800 in their executive committees. The city councils, of course, deal with matters that closely concern the population. The 2,046 Communist and Popular Democratic city councillors concentrate on issues that have a direct bearing on the people's condition. The Communists send large worker delegations to city council meetings when important questions come up for discussion.

Despite the great variety of forms and methods of Communist activity in city government, and despite the widely different conditions in socialist and capitalist countries, **Pavel Auersperg**, Executive Secretary of *WMR*, told the seminar, the Communists everywhere uphold the interests of the masses. It is typical of all their activity that they combine mass initiative with unremitting effort to enhance the Party's role in relation to all other city organisations, second, that they concentrate on the fundamental political and socio-economic interests of the working people, and third, that they search constantly for new forms better suited to the situation in the given country. This is why the Communists' activity in municipal bodies is a powerful factor impinging on the course and social trend of urbanisation. In the socialist countries, it has strong socio-economic foundations and benefits from the immense advantages of socialist as against bourgeois democracy, a fact which substantially increases the opportunities for urbanisation control and the population's participation in the solution of urban problems. As regards measures carried out by progressive forces in the capitalist countries at the municipal level, they cannot, for all their unquestionable usefulness and importance, bring about fundamental changes in the monopoly trend of urbanisation. The problems arising from urbanisation can be solved only if the working people's anti-monopoly struggle results not only in democratising the political system but in thoroughly altering its class nature by establishing the people's political power throughout the country.

The fact that municipal authority in socialist countries is based on genuine, socialist democracy, Yablokov, Kessler and Zuska emphasised, offers far greater opportunities for uniting the population and satisfying its requirements than in any variety of bourgeois democracy. Socialist democracy, Yablokov said, gives the masses a share in running the cities. This applies to every aspect of urban life and has become a cardinal factor in their development. In socialist countries, municipal organs are deeply democratic both in terms of composition and the aims and methods of their activity. Take the example of Yaroslavl: more than 65 per cent of members of the city Soviet are workers. All the city government bodies are under constant public control, with deputies regularly reporting back to their constituents. Besides, there are many different forms of direct participation in decision-making, especially now that the trade unions, the Komsomol and other mass organisations play a bigger role. Every citizen has the right to lodge complaints or proposals with the city Soviet and receive a satisfactory reply within a month.

An effective form of the working people's participation in running our cities, Kessler said, is regular discussion in the factories and residental areas of the city's annual, five-year and longer-range development plans. These discussions extend to every aspect of the city's economy and services. The trade unions and other mass organisations state their views on every draft plan. It is part of my job as Chairman of the city planning commission to report to the trade unions on the plan for the coming year, consider their suggestions and amend the plan if necessary. Also important is systematic analysis of suggestions made by the general public: municipal agencies are required once every three months to examine all suggestions regarding their functions.

In Prague, Zuska said, the most widely used form of contact with the population is through the civic committees. These committees, whose number corresponds exactly to the number of deputies to the district national committees of Prague, hold every year at least four joint meetings of deputies and the population to discuss problems of implementing the National Front's election programme. They also help to set up neighbourhood groups of activists, such as house commissions. There are now 1,030 civic committees involving 14,746 persons, with another 62,476 active in house commissions. This means that nearly one adult Prague citizen in ten has a share in the work of the city National Committee. Moreover, its members take careful account of proposals and criticisms made at regularly held public meetings. The deputies are required to inform the population of what is being done by the city and district National Committees and to organise voluntary public work projects. This is fully appreciated. In 1975, the people of Prague contributed 48 million work-hours to beautifying their city, which means that each devoted an average of 50 hours of voluntary labour. This and other facts confirm the unity of Communist Party policy and the interests of the people, and are indicative of the continuous development of socialist democraçy.

The discussion was summed up by Auersperg on behalf of the *WMR* commission on general theoretical problems. He noted that this was the first seminar on the social problems of urbanisation and the role of Communists in city government sponsored by the journal, which had thus brought up a new, important subject *WMR* would continue to publish articles on Communist policy towards urbanisation, setting out Communist experience in city government in socialist and capitalist countries. Urbanisation plays a growing role in society and the world revolutionary process, and the commission on general theoretical problems believes the journal should carry a series of articles on the sociological aspects of the problem, analysing the interaction of urbanisation and the scientific and technological revolution, their impact on the social and demographic structure, production, way of life, the individual's thinking, etc. This could be complemented by critical analysis of bourgeois urbanisation theories and the measures they propose. There should also be in-depth study of the theoretical and methodological problems of planning the development of socialist cities.

---

[1] The FCP representative sent in a paper.

Capitalism in Crisis: Conclusions for Our Strategy

Hermann Krüger
Member of Hesse District Committee Leadership, German Communist Party

IF we were to single out the essential changes in the productive forces and production relations of contemporary capitalism and in its international economic and political relations, we would have to list the following:

— the increasing impact of the dynamically developing socialist countries on the internal processes of monopoly capitalism;

— the marked development of capitalism's productive forces in conditions of the scientific and technological revolution. This objective tendency is stimulated by the laws of capitalist rivalry and by the struggle and competition of the two social systems;

— continued large-scale socialisation of the economy and the related internationalisation of production throughout the capitalist world;

— increasing state interference in the process of capitalist reproduction as the sequel to, and condition of, the continued concentration of capital; the new role of the capitalist state within the framework of its class function, with all its contradictory tendencies;

— aggravation of inter-imperialist contradictions, accentuating the unequal development of capitalist countries in the new world alignment of forces;

— the changed pattern of relations between the leading imperialist powers and the ex-colonies;

— changes in the energy and raw material basis of production (raw materials, energy and environmental problems);

— the new quality of the subjective factor—development of the working class vanguard, the international Communist movement, into the world's most influential political force;

— shifts in the social structure, changing in the place and role of classes in the production process and in the appropriation of its results; deepening of labour-capital class antagonisms.

A scientific analysis of these and a number of other questions relating to the deepening of the general crisis of capitalism is an essential condition of formulating and substantiating the new concepts and conclusions necessary for devising an effective strategy for the world's revolutionary forces.

By working out democratic alternatives for their countries, the Communist and Workers' parties in capitalist countries are making a meaningful contribution to analysis of new phenomena. The documents drawn up at international conferences of Communist and Workers' parties contain important generalisations that have become part of Marxism-Leninism. But the interaction of theory and practice is influenced both by the accelerated processes of social development and the problems it poses, and by the subjective ability of Marxists to apply the theoretical conclusions drawn from scientific analysis.

For Marxists of the Federal Republic of Germany the present crisis of

apitalism poses a number of new questions. The study "Economic Crisis and Economic Policy", compiled by the Marxist Research Institute in Frankfurt-m-Main is a valuable contribution to an understanding of these questions.[1]

First of all, let us examine some of the distinctive features of the intertwining of the present cyclical crisis and the general crisis of capitalism. Methodologically, it is advisable to single out these features because, as a rule, capitalist contradictions manifest themselves more *saliently against the* background of the cyclical crisis and, at the same time, bring out the long-term factors and symptoms of capitalism's general crisis. In the past, cyclical crises reflected not only the contradictions of capitalist reproduction accumulated in the relatively short cyclical period, but also the main contradiction of capitalism. Now, in this age of the general crisis of capitalism, the antagonism between the social character of production and the private capitalist form of appropriation stands out in greater clarity at every phase of the cycle.

West German imperialism, which again holds an important place in the world capitalist system, is no exception in this respect. Of course, individual features of the crisis can manifest themselves in the FRG to a greater or lesser degree than in other imperialist countries, but they always reflect the overall crisis trends of the imperialist system.

Up to the mid-sixties, due to the specifics of its economic development, West Germany was exempt from major cyclical upheavals, though there were recessions in 1953, 1958, 1963, and again in 1971. There were also two over-production crises, in 1966-67 and 1974-75, with the latter much sharper, deeper and longer than the former.

A characteristic feature of the 1974-75 crisis was its simultaneous impact on the main capitalist countries and on all spheres of the economy. In short, it was a "synchronised" world crisis. In striking contrast to this gloomy picture we witnessed the confident and dynamic development of the socialist countries. Indeed, it can be said that never before had the socialist economic system so convincingly demonstrated its superiority.

The last crisis vividly brought out the extent to which the FRG economy is dependent on foreign markets. A large part of its industry is geared to export, which in 1974 accounted for 24.2 per cent of total industrial output, and to as much as 50-60 per cent in some industries. This makes the FRG especially sensitive and vulnerable to crises of the capitalist world economy. In a crisis or recession situation low demand on the world market—no longer under the undivided control of the imperialist powers—can exacerbate all external and internal contradictions in the FRG.

In such situations West German imperialism tries to pressure other capitalist countries to take more of its exports. This worked in the 1966-67 crisis, which was not world-wide, and powered the boom phase of the cycle. But in the present world-wide recession, despite the reassuring official statements, laced with nationalist complacency, the FRG has sustained considerable losses precisely because of its dependence on exports.

The situation was further aggravated by the eroding effect of protracted inflation both in the FRG and other capitalist countries. Unlike the earlier recession of 1966-67, inflation, far from declining, continued to grow. Stagflation (stagnation + inflation), which hit the US in the mid-60s, became a

common feature of the crisis in the mid-70s, and has now struck the FRG economy for the first time (Table 1).

TABLE 1

	1968	1970	1972	1973	1974	1975	1976
Percentage growth of gross national income	7.2	5.0	3.5	5.3	0.0	−3.5	5.5
Percentage growth of consumer goods prices	2.0	5.2	5.8	7.2	7.3	6.1	4.5
Balance-of-trade surplus (000m DM)	18.4	15.7	20.3	33.0	50.8	37.3	34.6
Percentage share of nominal wages in national income	63.9	66.7	68.7	69.8	71.4	71.6	69.8
Percentage share of net wages in national income	44.9	44.7	44.8	43.6	43.9	43.8	—

Source: Gert Hautsch "Wirtschaftspolitik und Profitinteresse", Frankfurt-am-Main, 1976, S.36, 38, 40, 60. *Unsere Zeit*, 20 Dezember 1976.

The figures show that national-income growth came to a halt in 1974 and in the following year dropped by 3.5 per cent. Boosting exports and increasing the balance-of-trade surplus (from MD33,000 million in 1973 to 50,800 million in 1974)—a method employed in the previous crisis—together with other factors only bred more inflation: up to the early 1970s it was still at a "creeping" pace, but in 1973 and 1974 prices rose by 7.2-7.3 per cent.

The figures on the share of wages in national income refute all the specious arguments of bourgeois ideologists that inflation is due to wage rises, that is, higher wages are the cause and higher prices the effect. But the statistics point in another direction: prices are the cause and wages the effect.

The main cause of stagflation, so clearly indicated in the table, should be sought in concentration of production and centralisation of capital by a tight group of monopolists who are jacking up prices at the expense of the non-monopoly strata. The redistribution of national income in favour of the monopolists is much greater than the statistics suggest. Higher demand on the internal market, which alone can power an economic pick-up, depends directly on higher wages. But this runs counter to the capitalists' drive for maximum profits. Hence, the workers can win higher wages only through the class struggle and energetic trade union action.

Still another clear illustration of West Germany's involvement in the capitalist world crisis is unemployment, which increased from 300,000 before the crisis, to 1,351,000 in January 1976. To this figure should be added the more than 700,000 on short time. In other words, nearly a tenth of the country's wage and salary earners are either fully or partially unemployed, a situation unknown since the early 50s. The youth are especially hard hit with tens of thousands of young men and women "redundant" in the capitalist economy. In September 1975, 28.6 per cent of the unemployed were under 25 and 11.5 per cent under 20.

And the outlook is, to say the least, uncertain. Employment has declined by 1.3 million in the past three years, while output has risen by 3.2 per cent. The Bonn Ministry of the Economy estimates that an annual national-income growth of even 4.5 per cent will not cut back unemployment. According to

other estimates, West Germany will approach "full employment" only by the year 2000.[2]

The employment situation is compounded by under-capacity operation, especially painfully felt in this time of crisis. Even the chemical industry, one of the most dynamic, was operating at less than 70 per cent of capacity in 1975. Despite the 1976 pickup, industry is still operating at far below optimal levels.

Crises, inflation, unemployment, under-capacity operation--the whole complex of capitalism's internal contradictions can be fully understood only in the context of the competition and struggle of the two world systems, the continued advance of the socialist world system and the colossal changes that have transformed the world in the past 60 years. The objective tendency towards disintegration of imperialism—the result of its own antagonisms—and the contradiction between the two systems are the determinative factors in the deepening general crisis of capitalism The attitude of the forces working for the socialist refashioning of society to existing socialism is in our time the decisive element in any revolutionary strategy.

Trade between countries with different social systems now acquires especial importance. So far the socialist countries account for only a small share of West Germany's foreign trade, but the tendency, a very clear one, is towards a steady increase. Economic contacts with the socialist countries are not subject to the fluctuations of the capitalist world market. During the last crisis the FRG exported 7 per cent more to socialist countries and 9 per cent less to developed capitalist countries and 24 per cent less to the USA. In fact, the share of the developed capitalist countries in West German exports dropped from 80 per cent in 1973 to 72 per cent in 1975, whereas the share of the socialist countries increased to 10 per cent. Large orders from these countries provide about 150,000 jobs for West German workers Imports from the socialist countries also show a growth tendency: from DM8,300 million in 1973 they increased to 10,300 million in 1975.[3]

The deepening contradictions between developed capitalist and developing countries hold a special place in the tangle of problems facing capitalism. The world economic crisis of the mid-70s is the first in which imperialism can no longer rely on its colonial hinterland, with all the consequences following therefrom. The developing countries are playing a much more independent role in international affairs. West German imperialism is trying to get its raw materials straight from the developing countries through bilateral arrangements, bypassing the multinational monopolies. And to this end it is making full use of its economic strength. When the Nairobi UNCTAD conference (May 1976) categorically rejected the policy of bilateral links, designed to weaken solidarity of the developing countries, the West German imperialist elements resorted to interlocking investments with the oil-producing countries, notably Iran.

These are some of the new methods imperialism is employing to adapt to the changing conditions resulting from the uneven development of capitalism. Its object is to re-divide the spheres of influence and resolve inter-imperialist contradictions.

The profound crisis of bourgeois ideology, of the political system of

capitalist society, is a built-in feature of the general crisis of capitalism. In the FRG it extends to the imperialist-nurtured Right-opportunist ideology of the Social-Democrats. The euphoria of 1968, when the Social-Democrats came to power and launched their "reform policy", with its generous state support to the monopolies, is now but a fond memory. The much vaunted attempts to "cure the country of crisis", act as "physician at the bed of sick capitalism", have proved a complete failure. The Social-Democrats find themselves obliged to reckon with the Communists. The crisis of Right opportunism is jeopardising the entire system of West German imperialism. It is a component and expression of the general crisis of the capitalist system. The Social-Democrats (notably the S-D party leadership) are making strenuous efforts to win back the trust of the masses in their discredited policy and thus shift more of the crisis burden on to the people.

The deepening crisis of bourgeois ideology has led to more intensive nationalist propaganda as a means of diverting attention from the fact that, as distinct from 1966-67, capitalism's apologists can suggest no plausible way out of the crisis or ways of preventing its repetition.[4]

The German Communist Party is giving much attention to perfecting its anti-monopoly strategy on the basis of a Marxist analysis of the new phenomena at the present stage of the world revolutionary process. In preparing for its next congress and publication at the close of this year of the draft of its new Programme, our Party has initiated a wide discussion on West Germany's road to socialism. This lends great importance to the conclusions the working class draws for its revolutionary strategy from operation of the law of the uneven development of imperialism discovered by Lenin.

There is the proof of experience that this law is fully operative today. The present crisis is continuously changing the alignment of imperialist forces. The two most important changes are in the relations between the three world centres of capitalism, the US, Western Europe and Japan, and relations within the EEC. West German imperialism aspires to a leading role in Western Europe and is trying to increase its influence on world politics.

This is the picture as expressed in shares of capitalist world industrial output (Table 2).

TABLE 2

	1948	1960	1970	1975[1]
USA	54.6	45.7	40.3	37.6
EEC[2]	23.3	28.1	26.2	24.4
including:				
FRG	3.6	8.8	8.6	7.9
Britain	10.2	8.3	6.1	5.4
France	4.6	5.0	5.0	5.1
Japan	1.2	4.4	9.0	8.7
Other capitalist countries[2]	20.9	21.8	24.5	29.3

[1] Estimate.
[2] EEC nine.
Source: Monthly Bulletin of Statistics. U.N. November, 1976, *Horizont*, Berlin. G.D.R. Nr. 17, 1974.

The table shows that the USA, though it has lost some of its positions, is still the strongest imperialist power with a very impressive technological lead.

As for the EEC, its economic growth has been attended by an internal power struggle, influenced by the FRG's strengthened position relative to the other eight countries.

The facts show that the objective trend towards more internationalisation of the productive forces and towards capitalist integration do not lead to "coalescence" of the imperialist powers. In fact, the contradiction between the objective process of internationalisation of the productive forces and the discordant interests of individual imperialist states and monopoly groups has become sharper still.[5] Furthermore, resolution of inter-imperialist contradictions is achieved in a non-military way. And this, in our opinion, is a new factor in the regularities of capitalism in the present changed world correlation of forces. But it should be equally clear that, for all these new developments, the nature of imperialism, its substance, remain the same, and its basic laws, discovered by Lenin, continue to operate.

Lenin wrote: "Uneven economic and political development is an absolute law of capitalism. Hence, the victory of socialism is possible first in several or even in one capitalist country alone" (*Coll. Works*, Vol. 21, p. 242). And there is the evidence of history that an objective, rather than subjective, assessment of imperialist contradictions and antagonisms and of the other factors that make for a revolutionary situation, is essential for the victory of socialist revolution. That was so in Russia, which in 1917 was the focal point of imperialist contradictions and the weakest links in the imperialist system. History has refuted Trotsky, who denied the possibility of socialism triumphing in one country and advanced his own theory of "permanent revolution". Lenin's theory of revolution, formulated on the basis of a Marxist analysis of imperialism, was fully confirmed in 1917 and by the subsequent march of history. The second world war ended with the victory of socialism in several countries that had become weak links in the imperialist chain. Fresh confirmation of Lenin's theory has been provided by the socialist revolutions in Cuba and Vietnam.

However, despite these convincing historical precedents, the discussion continues about the possibility of a socialist victory under present conditions in one country, which could be in West Europe. The serious mistakes on this problem—these relapses into Trotskyism, which Lenin so vigorously fought—are, in the final analysis, due to an underestimation of the objective contradictions of imperialism. Researchers are of the opinion that the revival of Trotskyist views "is connected with the uneven maturing of the objective and subjective factors of the world revolutionary process, with the difficulties attending its development".[6]

There are at least two answers to the theoretical question of whether new victories for socialism are possible. The first answer is that a socialist revolution in one, notably West-European country, is now impossible because its working class would be confronted by all, or at any rate the main, imperialist powers. And from this it is deduced that socialist revolution can be victorious only if it occurs simultaneously in all the main West-European countries. The second answer is that inter-imperialist contradictions make it possible to

accomplish the revolution in one country alone, but only if there is no imperialist intervention.

We are deeply convinced that if the victory of socialism in one country was possible in 1917, when there were no other socialist countries, then it should be even more possible now, with the existence of the powerful socialist world system, and with the balance of world forces steadily changing in favour of socialism. Our Party takes the following factors into consideration.

Both of these theoretical propositions presuppose close co-operation and solidarity of the revolutionay parties of all countries. This is necessary, for without a definite level of revolutionary unity the chances of success are nil. But when applied to the practical class struggle, these two propositions translate into sharply different patterns of strategy and tactics. Thus, orientation on simultaneous victory in a number of countries could, on the one hand, lead to disregarding a revolutionary situation on the plea that a similar situation had not yet developed in other countries. On the other hand, a wrong assessment of the situation in one's own country, on the false plea that a revolutionary situation had developed in other countries, could lead to adventurist leftist actions.

We do not, of course, deny that a number of new factors and possibilities have arisen and should be taken into account in formulating revolutionary strategy. In particular, it is quite realistic to envisage that the intertwining of the class struggle on a world scale could produce a "chain reaction" of socialist revolution. Lenin, it will be recalled, repeatedly referred to a victorious revolution in "one or several countries". This would only *expand* the revolutionaries' field of action.

The mistake lies not in accepting the possibility of simultaneous action by several national revolutionary contingents, but in denying or underestimating the possibility of a victorious revolution, in present conditions, in one country alone.

---

[1] "Wirtschaftskrise und Wirtschaftspolitik", IMSF, Frankfurt/Main, 1976.

[2] *Frankfurter Rundschau*, Dec. 31, 1976.

[3] *Frankfurter-Allgemeine Zeitung*, 9.12.1976; *Wirtschaft un Statistik*, Nr. 2, 1976

[4] cf. "*Bürgerliche Okonomie ohne Perspektive*, Berlin, 1976, pp 185-228.

[5] Thus, the *Frankfurter-Rundschau* (Dec. 27, 1976) wrote: "The monetary gap between the 'strong' countries, the FRG, Benelux and Denmark and the 'sick' countries Italy, Britain and Ireland, has become wider. France is coming closer to the second group."

[6] *Bürgerliche Okonomie ohne Perspektive*, p. 513.

Essential Condition for Progress

United Action by the Patriotic Forces and International Solidarity

BAQIR IBRAHIM
CC Politbureau Member, CP Iraq

OURS is an age of impressive victories for progressive humanity in the fight for peace, democracy and social progress. Radical changes have given the world a new political shape and one of these changes is the emergence of a large group of countries that have freed themselves of colonial oppression and are making increasing efforts to consolidate their political independence and economic liberation and achieve a cultural renaissance.

A natural result of the development of the national revolutions in a growing number of newly-free countries is their socialist orientation. Experience shows that this orientation, which puts the country that chooses it in the vanguard of the liberation movement, is most effective and meaningful on two conditions. One, that there is close interaction between the progressive national forces and, two, that they maintain close contacts with the revolutionary forces across the world, particularly the countries of the socialist community. In other words, what we are talking about is the importance of the patriotic and internationalist principles in shaping national unity and determining the revolutionary course.

In our view, the question of the correlation of patriotism and internationalism in the political life of the countries that have chosen the non-capitalist road is of great theoretical and practical importance. Without claiming to discuss the matter fully we shall attempt in this article to show, by the example of Iraq, and some other Arab countries, that the combination, the mutual complementing of these two elements is an essential condition for the successful advance of the socialist trend.

Since the early twenties of this century the Iraqi masses have been fighting the domination of imperialism and internal reaction. It was thanks to their revolutionary drive and determination that the pro-imperialist monarchist regime was overthrown and the aggressive Baghdad pact abolished in 1958. Our country has today become a truly sovereign state, firmly set on the path of non-capitalist development. These crucial victories would, of course, have been inconceivable without the patriotic alliance of the country's revolutionary forces. It is no secret that in the 1963-1968 period, when this alliance was broken, the Iraqi revolution came to a grinding halt. It only got under way again after the progressive wing of the Baath Socialist Party came to power in 1968.

A major landmark in the revolutionary process came in July 1973 when agreement was reached between Baath and the Iraqi Communist Party on the Charter of National Action, which became the platform of the Progressive National-Patriotic Front (PNPF). Since then, other parties and organisations have joined the front.

The Iraqi Communists regard the unity of the progressive patriotic forces thus achieved as a powerful boost for the national-democratic revolution. We are therefore doing our best not only to prevent any weakening of the PNPF but to keep it going full blast. As was stressed at the enlarged plenum of the Iraqi

Communist Party's Central Committee, held last February, our Party is convinced that rallying the contingents aligned in the progressive front, deepening national unity, turning the front into an active political force and overcoming the mistakes and adverse developments of the past in the relationship between the Communists and the Baathists, constitute a vital necessity and indispensable condition for Iraq's advance to socialism, a guarantee that any hostile operations against the republic will be thwarted.

At the same time the Iraqi experience indicates that the internal political factors for successful advance of the national-democratic revolution, which in themselves are, of course, decisive, become most effective when the alliance of progressive patriotic forces makes full use of the opportunities afforded by international proletarian solidarity. In the present situation this solidarity is more meaningful to the peoples of the developing countries than previously, when it amounted mainly to supporting their struggle for independence. Today it has shown itself to be an important, indeed essential condition for accelerating socio-economic progress in the young states, stimulating the masses to turn away from the capitalist road of development and encouraging their desire to remould society on socialist lines. In respect of the support that the countries of the socialist community give the newly-free countries, there has been a significant and, in some cases, decisive intensification of its economic aspect, i.e., help in developing the national productive forces and the struggle for economic independence of imperialism.

All this encourages internationalist trends in the national liberation movement itself and proletarian internationalism in the world view of its progressive, revolutionary-democratic sections, particularly in the Arab countries.[1]

Between the patriotic alliance of the revolutionary forces within the country and their international alliance we see a close interconnection that it would be wrong to interpret mechanically. In our view it is dynamic, dialectical and many-sided. The deepening of the national-democratic revolution and acceleration of socio-economic development in a socialist direction have a significant effect on the patriotic alliance itself. They narrow the political gaps between the participants and enlarge their scope for joint action. At the same time this helps to bring them closer to their natural external allies in the anti-imperialist struggle and pave the way for long-term and increasingly fruitful co-operation with them.

In other words, the building of international revolutionary solidarity and raising the level and effectiveness of the support for the national-democratic revolution offered by the external allies depend to a great extent on the will and effort of the mass of the people, on the activities of their political vanguard in the given country. In their turn, the gains of the national-democratic revolution make a contribution to the world revolutionary process proportional to their significance in the homeland. Thus the deep-going dialectical interconnection between the patriotic and international alliances takes effect only in the course of the mass struggle, and only in this struggle is the basis created for a united front of progressive forces at the national and international levels.

We Iraqi Communists can state with satisfaction that the uniting of the progressive patriotic forces in our country stems precisely from such a conception of this interconnection. As the Charter of National Action stresses, "the revolutionary movement in Iraq is a viable and effective part of the world revolutionary anti-imperialist movement". The Charter also notes the "complete

nd decisive nature of Iraq's entry into the camp of the peoples fighting against nperialism, aggression and race discrimination, and Iraq's universal support for ıe liberation movements and progressive forces".

On the question of the link between the Arab national liberation movement nd the world revolutionary process the Charter points out that "the unity of ction of the Arab countries, the mobilisation of their efforts and energies in the ruggle against the subterfuges and aggressive plans of imperialism, Zionism nd the forces of reaction, their strengthening of co-operation with the socialist ountries constitute a vital condition for the success of the struggle against the raeli-imperialist aggression". Of special importance is "the alliance that is being uilt on strategic principles between the emancipated progressive Arab regimes nd the progressive movements of the Arab homeland, on the one hand, and the rces of world revolution led by the socialist camp, on the other". Thus, as a hole, far from contrasting patriotism and internationalism, as the opponents of ıe Communists and their participation in the front would like it to, the Charter n the contrary, builds an organic link between these two concepts.

From the standpoint of external support for the anti-imperialist struggle of the eoples of the newly-free countries their alliance with the world socialist system lays an extremely important role. It is quite natural that, all other things being qual, the links between a developing country and the world socialist system tend o expand and strengthen as its home and foreign policies become more socially rogressive and anti-imperialist. Conversely, any weakening of these links is sually due to the abandonment of a policy furthering the aspirations of the vorking masses and to neglect of true national interests in foreign policy.

In recent years, as we know, such a swing has occurred in the policy of Egypt's uling circles under the leadership of President Sadat. These circles have almost ntirely abandoned social change that benefits the working people, the policy of trengthening the state sector, the non-capitalist road of development, and have acked out of the struggle against imperialism and reaction. Most of what they re doing today expresses the selfish interests of the local bourgeoisie, which are a ar cry from those of the people and social progress. Simultaneously it is designed o "keep happy" certain Western and Arab reactionary circles, while the masses, he democratic forces of Egypt are subjected to persecution and repression. In the policies adopted by Egypt's present leaders it is easy to trace a direct link between he departure from patriotic positions in home and foreign policy and the epudiation of alliance and friendship with the socialist and progressive forces on he international scene.

Of course, a very active role in the reorientation of the Egyptian ruling circles was played by the imperialists, whose operations inside the newly-free countries employing the traditional methods of subversion, sabotage and counter-revolutionary conspiracies are aimed against patriotic unity and, on the nternational plane, against the internationalist solidarity of world socialism and he national liberation movement. Weakening of the solidarity and particularly ts deliberate subversion improves the monopolies' chances of exploiting these ountries by neo-colonialist methods.

It is worth noting that in addition to such methods of fighting the forces of iberation and progress as export of counter-revolution and direct military hreats (which may go as far as the unleashing of local conflicts that endanger vorld peace) international reaction is making ever wider use of ideological

subversion. All kinds of "theories" are peddled including those that equate th socialist and capitalist systems as allegedly bearing "equal responsibility" for th social and economic lag of the developing countries, and treat the non-aligne movement as a rejection of both systems. Such views, unfortunately, are sti current in some sections of the national liberation movement, particularly th Arab movement. They are actively preached by Egypt's present leaders.

It should also be remembered that the imperialists quite often find usefu helpers among the Right-wing opportunists and "Left" revisionists in the rank of the most progressive forces. These imperialist agents do everything they can t slander the true patriotism of the Communists, democrats and othe revolutionaries who uphold the principles of internationalism. They spread fals notions of an alleged contradiction between patriotism and internationalism thus striving to isolate the revolutionaries, destroy their unity and hold back th progressive forces. All these imperialist stratagems have obviously had an effec on the positions of Sadat and his supporters.

Sadat has always tried to hide his repudiation of everything that in Presiden Nasser's time made Egypt the most powerful anti-imperialist force in our area with demagogic slogans calculated to appeal mainly to the politicall uninformed and inexperienced sections of the population. However, the pro imperialist policy of the present Egyptian leaders, which has been accompanie by a deterioration in relations with the Soviet Union and other countries of th socialist community has quickly had disastrous economic results for the people The hopes of gradual elimination of the consequences of the Zionist aggressio by means of separate partial agreements have also turned out to be an illusion

The January demonstrations in Egypt expressed the working people' condemnation of the "open door" policy (open to imperialism and reaction!) an their firm resolve to continue the struggle against Israeli aggression, for th liberation of the occupied territories, for a way out of the economic crisis tha would benefit the broad masses, and for restoring relations of friendship and co operation with the Soviet Union and other socialist countries. The genuinel progressive forces in Egypt emphatically reject the lie that Sadat is trying to foi on the people regarding the allegedly anti-Egyptian attitude of the Soviet Unio and the whole socialist community in matters pertaining to the Arab peoples' jus struggle against the Zionist-imperialist alliance.

The anti-imperialist solidarity of the socialist and developing countries is based on common interests and aims, on mutual respect and mutua responsibility to the world revolutionary movement. This solidarity has become the basis for a new type of international relations, both economic and political. It is a bastion in the developing countries' struggle for equality and against discrimination in relations with the capitalist powers. World socialism's support of the young countries does not make them subordinate to or dependent on a foreign will. On the contrary, it helps them to strengthen their independence, to preserve their self-esteem, to rebuff the attacks of the united forces of imperialism and internal reaction, to achieve successes in various fields of development, and to increase their contribution to progressive humanity's fight for a better future.

Iraq's experience shows how fruitful close and friendly relations with the socialist countries can be. For instance, they have helped the Iraqi people to break the eonomic blockade set up by the imperialists after the nationalisation of the Iraq Petroleum Company on June 1, 1972. Characteristically, the act of

ıationalisation became possible only after Iraq and the Soviet Union, on April 9, 972, had concluded a treaty of friendship and co-operation.

With Soviet help Iraq set up in North Rumaila its first national, state-run entre for the exploitation of oil resources. The centre now has an annual output ıf 42 million tons. In Iskanderya an agricultural machinery factory has been put nto operation that is one of the biggest industrial enterprises in the Middle East .nd exports part of its output. The Soviet Union has helped Iraq to boost its lefence capacity considerably. An event of major importance for Iraq was the onclusion, in July 1975, of a treaty with the CMEA on economic, technological ,nd cultural co-operation. The signing of this treaty indicates major progress in raq's political, economic and cultural relations with the countries of the socialist ommunity. The CMEA countries and the Republic of Iraq have instituted a ɔint commission to ensure growing co-operation, including industrial onstruction.

The assistance of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries is designed ırimarily to help build up new, progressive branches of the economy. In Iraq ɔday 200 big projects have been put into operation and 150 others are being built /ith the co-operation of the CMEA countries.

The socialist countries are giving Iraq effective assistance in training national ersonnel. In the technical colleges and industrial enterprises of these countries ver 3,000 future Iraqi engineers and technicians are undergoing training. Ten entres for training specialists in such industries as oil, textiles, and machine-uilding have been set up in Iraq itself in recent years with the help of CMEA ɔuntries. They have already turned out about 40,000 skilled workers, engineers nd technicians.

For the Iraqi masses the country's rapid economic and social progress is ıseparable from the development of friendship and co-operation with the world ɔcialist system, above all the Soviet Union. These relations have become even 'ronger since the visit to the USSR in February 1977 of a Party and government elegation led by Saddam Hussein, Deputy General Secretary of the Baath :gional leadership and Deputy Chairman of the Revolutionary Command. The raqi Communist Party is confident that the new perspectives of co-operation in he political and economic spheres and in strengthening Iraq's defence potential hat were defined during the visit will consolidate the positions and role of our ountry in the struggle against imperialism, Zionism and reaction, and for a etter future for the Iraqi people. We are convinced that the strategic alliance etween our countries is essential for the building of a new exploitation-free ɔciety, taking into account Iraq's special features.

In times of victory and defeat, in the difficult day-to-day work of revolutionary truggle our Iraqi people—Arabs, Kurds and other national minorities -like all he Arab peoples fighting imperialism, reaction and backwardness, have relied n the international solidarity of the world revolutionary movement, the socialist ystem and its vanguard, the Soviet Union. This solidarity will undoubtedly ɔntinue to be a firm bastion in the struggle of the Arab nation against Israeli ggression, for ending the occupation of the Arab territories and safeguarding ıe legitimate rights of the Arab Palestine people, including its right to set up an ıdependent national state.

The experience of our Party, of all the revolutionary democratic forces of Iraq ıows that in present conditions a further deepening of international

...

revolutionary solidarity can be achieved only on the basis of fidelity to the well-tried principle of proletarian internationalism. Such fidelity is a firm guarantee of continued success for the peoples of the newly-free countries in their struggle against imperialism and neocolonialism.

This year all progressive humanity is celebrating the 60th anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution. The experience of socialist construction in the world's first state of workers and peasants is of enduring significance for any country that is heading towards socialism. The Iraqi Communists are convinced that, guided by the general basic laws of development towards socialism discovered by Marxist-Leninist science and creatively applied in the Soviet Union and other socialist countries, and employing them with due regard, of course, for national conditions and specific features, building on the all-round support of world socialism, it will be possible to protect our people from many troubles and difficulties and the risk of counter-revolution. Here we have one of the most important and valuable features of the international alliance of all the revolutionary forces that is today going from strength to strength.

[1] See the article by Aziz Muhammed, "The Socialist Community Is Our Dependable Ally" in the January 1975 issue of *WMR*.

[2] See Naim Ashhab, "For an Overall Settlement in the Middle East", *WMR*, December 1976

The Press

Internationalism and National Interests

Janos Kadar, *Internacionalizmus, nemzeti erdek*. Magveto Diado, Budapest, 1976, 252 p.

The Hungarian people, led by the Hungarian Socialist Workers' Party (HSWP), are building a developed socialist society. As they strive for this major goal, it becomes increasingly important that the working people's socialist world outlook should be further widened and the ideas of socialist patriotism and proletarian internationalism popularised. What the world Communist movement really needs is a clear Marxist-Leninist awareness of the link between the national revolutionary struggle and proletarian solidarity, and a correct understanding of the unity of national and international interests. Detente and the class struggle have raised the importance and role of ideological factors in international affairs, and higher standards have to be reached in propaganding socialist ideas and criticising bourgeois and opportunist concepts.

All the more topical is the new book *Internationalism and National Interests* by Janos Kadar, First Secretary of the HSWP.

This book, which is a collection of articles and speeches covering the last fifteen years, conveys the basic thought that the revolutionary party of the Hungarian working class is both a patriotic and internationalist party and that

the national and the international have always been inherent in its work. "Our Party's policy," Kadar said on the 50th anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution, "furthers the interests of the working class, our people and our national goals and, at the same time, it is internationalist. We believe that if it had not served national interests, it would not have served the interests of the international working class and, if it had not been internationalist, it would have endangered our country's interests." (p. 134).

Such dialectical reasoning illustrates the HSWP's deep concern for the destiny of the Hungarian nation and the international workers' movement and shows that its policy is an alloy of patriotism and internationalism, two interlocking aspects of its commitment to the socialist cause.

The HSWP's general political course is based on the application of the laws governing the establishment and development of socialism to our country's national conditions.

The book gives a broad picture of the Party's many-sided analytical work in creatively applying international Marxist-Leninist theory to Hungarian conditions. Drawing on the historical experience of the Hungarian revolutionary workers' movement, the HSWP, writes Janos Kadar, needs the conclusions reached by the fraternal parties. Of particular importance to the Hungarian Communists is the never-ageing experience of the CPSU, the experience of the first country of existing socialism, a "depository of knowledge indispensable to all Communist and Workers' parties, and to each socialist country". (p. 122).

The HSWP took the best road and planned the realistic policy that has ensured calm and broad creative endeavour over the past 20 years, steadily increasing the leading role of the working class and building up its authority.

The Party educates the people in a spirit of socialist patriotism and internationalism. This book shows that the country's new, enriched patriotism embraces the progressive traditions formed in the course of the Hungarian people's struggle for independence and social progress. We may confidently build our patriotism on these values, particularly on the gains made by our people's revolutions and the revolutionary workers' movement, linking them with respect for the progressive traditions and achievements of other peoples.

Explaining the meaning of socialist patriotism, Janos Kadar writes that the working class is society's motive force, which expresses the people's interests through its revolutionary party. He shows that socialism and communism are the country's today and tomorrow and, therefore, the main source of patriotism today is a justified pride in the steady realisation of the social ideals of the working class, in the historic transformations of past decades and the building of developed socialism. A person's contribution to socialist endeavour, to the building of socialism, is the greatest measure of patriotism and of serving one's country, and the importance of these factors is increasing. The great majority of the adult population, Kadar continues, accepts, and by its common effort confirms that "socialism is the Hungarian people's programme and future" (p. 212).

Our socialist patriotism is expressed in specific conditions. The HSWP does not forget that it was the Soviet Union that liberated the Hungarian people, and our free and independent development is inseparably bound up with the achievements of the fraternal socialist countries and all progressive movements. That is why our patriotic ideal, embodying all progressive, democratic and

socialist elements, is closely linked with internationalism and helps greatly in dealing with national problems and in strengthening our ties with other nations.

From similar historical positions Janos Kadar examines internationalism in connection with the tasks facing the world Communist movement today. "It is impossible," he writes, "to carry out and embody internationalism in abstraction, it can be expressed only in a necessarily specific attitude to questions posed by life itself" (p. 127). The conclusion to be drawn is that the class foundations of proletarian internationalism do not change, they remain based on the world outlook and political goals of the revolutionary working class. Their content and forms, however, are developed and enriched by the objective demands of our times. This analysis of internationalism stresses the need to continue extending Hungary's ties with the Soviet Union and the other fraternal countries and strengthening the might and influence of the socialist world system. Socialist Hungary, writes Kadar, will continue to identify itself with the revolutionary and anti-monopoly forces in the capitalist countries and its support of the anti-imperialist struggle of the oppressed nations, the young independent states and the world's peace forces. The logical conclusion is that proletarian internationalism advances both socialist and democratic goals.

It is apparent from the speeches and articles included in this volume that over the past fifteen years, Janos Kadar, ever sensitive to world events, has given his constant and close attention to the problem of co-operation between the main revolutionary forces of our day—the socialist world system, the workers' movement in the capitalist countries and the national liberation fighters, and especially to the problem of strengthening the unity of the international Communist movement. In conditions "where every party is independent," writes Kadar, "and where the independent and sovereign socialist states settle their affairs themselves, "it is particularly important to maintain the purity of Marxist-Leninist theory and abide by the principles of proletarian internationalism (pp. 126-127). "The achievements of individual parties," said Kadar at the Berlin Conference of Communist and Workers' parties of Europe, "strengthens our movement, and strengthening the international Communist movement means helping every individual party". This growing revolutionary unity stands firmly on such democratic norms characteristic of our movement as coordination of national and international interests, comradely co-operation through regular bilateral and multilateral meetings and exchanges of views, a careful analysis and summing up of experience, all of which helps us to achieve a comprehensive elaboration of complex problems, formulate common positions and decide on collective methods of action.

Ideologically and politically this book is important to our Party. It provides us with a guide in our theoretical work and political activities. It advances the international and patriotic education of Hungarian youth and all working people and sets forth the views of the HSWP on further strengthening the unity of the world Communist movement.

Karoly Lipkovics

Broad Panorama of Class Battles

Miedzynarodowy Ruch Robotniczy. Tom 1 i 2, Warszawa, Ksiazka i Wiedza, 1976.

This two-volume study, *The International Working-Class Movement*, compiled by the Working-Class Movement Institute of the CC PUWP Higher School of Social Sciences, is the first of its kind to be published in Poland.

The working-class movement of every country has its own history, but its development follows laws and regularities that are common for all countries. The authors therefore regard the history of the international working-class movement as a single process of which the central element is the transition from spontaneous proletarian actions in defence of vital rights to organised forms of class struggle and its increasing internationalisation.

The first volume gives a detailed account of the unorganised and organised forms of working-class struggles, including the history of the three Internationals and of other international organisations brought to life by the development of the labour movement.

Volume II, covering the period from 1945 to 1975, discusses the basic problems of the movement's strategy and tactics and its place in the world revolutionary process. Chapter One examines in some detail the main trends of development of the world Communist movement, the growing influence of the Communist and Workers' parties, forms of their co-operation and international unity. Chapter Two analytically describes the formation of the socialist world system, Chapter Three deals with the activities of the Communist and Workers' parties in developed capitalist countries, and Chapter Four deals with the problems of present-day Social Democracy. The last, Fifth Chapter, is devoted to the development of the national-liberation movements and the role the Communists play in them.

Revolutionary practice of the world Communist and working-class movement is examined against the background of the ideology and policy of its class enemy, the imperialist bourgeoisie, now forced onto the defensive in every sector of the front. This comparison enables the authors convincingly to demonstrate the moral and political strength and historical correctness of the Communists, their consistent struggle for peace, democracy, national liberation and social progress, and for socialism. And there is an in-depth analysis of the Communists' steadily growing influence on the destinies of the world we live in. In discussing the achievements of the working class and its vanguard, the Communist parties, the authors make no attempt to obscure the movement's difficulties. On the contrary, they show that the working-class movement is confronted with a strong adversary having at its command a powerful repressive machine of government and an equally powerful propaganda machine enabling it to maintain its hold on a considerable part of capitalist society and exert a strong ideological influence on the working class.

Central to the political history of the international working-class movement, the authors note, is the controversy between the revolutionary and reformist trends over what path should be followed to popular rule, to socialism (Vol. I, p. 11).

This controversy has been resolved by history, by the victorious socialis revolutions begun by the Great October Socialist Revolution in Russia. Of th many theories of how to refashion society worked out by working-class politica organisations, history has confirmed the viability of only one, Marxism Leninism. And existing socialism, the practical embodiment of that theory, ha raised the entire process of social development to a qualitatively new plane.

Examination of the two main trends in the working-class movement, th revolutionary and the Social-Democratic, focuses on the all-important an formidable problem of overcoming the split in the ranks of the working class The present stage of the revolutionary process calls for mobilisation of th overwhelming majority of society to fight for progressive social change. An that, in turn, calls for united action by all the working-class politica organisations. The authors rightly emphasise that no matter how great are th differences between the Communists and Social Democrats over ideological an organisational principles, they must not be allowed to become insurmountabl obstacles to joint action.

The national contingents of the international Communist movement ar united by identical aims, ideological and organisational principles. Though eac Communist party is formed and conducts its principles as a national politica force, the results of its struggle also have international implications. In th context the Polish authors draw attention to the following essential factor in th interaction of the national and the international: the intensive process (internationalisation of all revolutionary and liberation movement accompanied, however, by accentuated differentiation of the concrete conditior in which each party has to work and, consequently, by a clearer nationa character of each party's programme for revolutionary change.

The analysis of new aspects in Communist party strategy in develope capitalist countries is another interesting feature of the study. The author examine in detail the question of the interrelation of the democratic and th socialist stages of the revolution.

By demonstrating the link between history and our time, and by analysing th crucial and urgent problems of Marxist-Leninist theory and revolutionar practice, the Polish historians have enriched our knowledge of politics in th world of today.

Janusz Janick

Pathfinders of History

V. Korionov, *Ustremlenniye v budushcheye: Kommunisty v sovremennom mire* (Those Who Look Ahead: Communists in Today's World). Moscow Politizdat, 1976. 231 pp.

The finest qualities of a Communist stand out above all at sharp turns in history, when class battles are at their bitterest. This is the keynote of Vitaly Korionov's book. It is Communists who in hours of severe trial show the greatest courage, stamina and boundless devotion to the cause of all working people

"The Communist movement, which has set itself goals no previous political movement was equal to, has produced leaders unmatched in past history" (p. 127). A recent example of selfless loyalty to communist ideals is that of Luis Corvalan, General Secretary of the Communist Party of Chile, who showed admirable staunchness in the more than three years he spent in prisons of the Pinochet fascist regime. The author gives vivid portrayals of the activity of Luis Corvalan, of the life and work of other indomitable Communists --Rodney Arismendi, Alvaro Cunhal, Gus Hall, Henry Winston, Victorio Codovilla, Rodolfo Ghioldi.

"Communists have always been active in decisive political battlefields, fighting for the people's freedom and happiness" (p. 229). They are front-rank builders of the new life in the countries of the socialist community, which now have advanced economies, science and culture, enjoy international recognition and prestige and play an increasing role in the world. The book tells of the unprecedented creative enthusiasm of the peoples building socialism.

The author writes about Communists who are in the forefront of working-class struggles in capitalist countries, of the fight of all left-wing forces against monopoly power, for the fundamental interests of labour, for democracy and socialism. Citing examples to illustrate the immense difficulty of this struggle, he quotes Lenin's statement that "only the Communist Party, if it is really the vanguard of the revolutionary class... is capable of leading the proletariat in a final, most ruthless and decisive struggle against all the forces of capitalism" (*Coll. Works*, Vol. 31, pp. 187-188).

The book stresses the Communists' growing role in the developing countries, where they are fighting against economic backwardness, for the independent and democratic development of their states.

In depicting the manifold activities of Communists, the author relates his impressions of his wide travels and of people he has met. Every interview, he notes, was added evidence that the working people are becoming increasingly aware of the historical truth of Communist ideas and that this earns the Communists growing support.

"Decades and centuries will pass. Mankind will scale the greatest heights of historical progress. People will not only transform the planet but conquer outer space. But future generations will never forget those who laid the groundwork for this turn in history's fiercest battles" (p. 230).

E. Wolf

The Army and the People

Elisabeth Reimann Weigert, Fernando Rivas Sanchez, *Las Fuerzas Armadas de Chile: un caso de penetracion imperialista* (The Armed Forces of Chile: A Case of Imperialist Penetration). Editorial de ciencias sociales, Havana, 1976, 313 pp.

The complex processes at work in the armed forces of Latin American countries are discussed in a growing number of books on the political role of the army.

Numerous internal and international factors influence the military's choice of its place in the struggle of the peoples of the continent. The pressure exerted by imperialist forces on the political orientation of the military poses the greatest dangers to the peoples concerned. The book under review, written by two noted Chilean journalists, concentrates on this problem.

Drawing on facts, official documents, various publications and the evidence of ex-servicemen, the authors show that the heinous crimes of the Chilean military fascist junta, which caused revulsion throughout the world, were a result of imperialist subversion involving a fierce anti-Communist campaign in Chile's armed forces.

"Ideological infiltration was a direct factor in using the Chilean armed forces against the people. The armed forces objectively found themselves under US influence. . ." (pp. 68-69). This was made possible, first of all, by the establishment of US control over arms deliveries to Chile and over the training of Chile's army. To this end, the Pentagon sent its instructors to Chile; at the same time, thousands of Chilean army officers and NCOs took training in the United States.

Quoting American sources, the authors point out that those selected for training in the USA come from morally and politically unstable petty-bourgeois strata characterised by conservative and anti-Communist prejudice. Political ignorance and an extremely distorted notion of the meaning of developments at home and abroad were apparently expected to help them assimilate "pathological anti-communism' and make them "mercenaries protecting the property of big US consortiums" (p. 20) and unquestioning executors of other people's will, men ready to commit any crime.

Shortly before the coup, US instructors and "psychological war" experts and the reactionary press of Chile told the country's servicemen day after day that the Communists were set on "destroying" the armed forces and "threatened" their lives, homes and families, their standard of living and their very existence (p. 162). Aggressive sentiments and sadistic inclinations were fomented by openly propagating fascist ideas, slandering Popular Unity and creating an atmosphere of mass hysteria in the army. "I had to shoot,'" a Chilean ex-serviceman reminiscences. "I didn't know who it was I fired on or why but I had to do it. My task was to kill. It was the only thing I understood from all that I'd been taught" (p. 209).

The tragic events in Chile, the book stresses, are added proof that bourgeois theoreticians are lying when they say the army is "above classes" and politics and fulfils tasks "of the whole people". Those events showed that Marxists-Leninists are right in describing the army as an all-important instrument of the state in any exploiting society, a political instrument of the ruling classes.

The authors by no means identify all Chilean servicemen with imperialist agents or fascists. There were army officers who condemned the coup and the violence used by the armed forces. Military men devoted to the Constitution, such as General Carlos Prats, who was dastardly murdered by junta agents, spoke of the troops' involvement in the coup and their role of "executioners of the people" as "the most terrible historical mistake" (p. 271). The authors express the hope that the bona fide men in the Chilean armed forces will be able in the end "to place themselves in the service of the oppressed masses" (p. 271).

US imperialism uses its experience of interference in Chilean affairs to

infiltrate the armed forces of foreign countries (p. 4). This presents a serious threat to the peoples' struggle for freedom, independence and social progress. The exposures made in the book are a call for vigilance addressed to progressive, democratic forces throughout Latin America, in every country of the world on which the Pentagon succeeds in imposing its military doctrines and its methods of brainwashing army personnel.

V. Valejo

From the "New Left" to the Old Right

On Günther Nenning's Book "Realists or Traitors?"[1]

A WORD about the author of the book to begin with because he is hardly known to readers outside Austria and West Germany, and also because a knowledge of his political biography gives a deeper insight into the content and message of his book.

Günther Nenning began his political career shortly after World War II as a Social Catholic journalist writing for the SPA (Socialist Party of Austria) newspaper in Graz. From there he moved to Vienna, where he was enabled to publish a magazine.

Nenning repeatedly changed his convictions over a relatively short period of time by alternatively advocating rightist and ultra-leftist theories. As an ally of the "new Left", he made the columns of his magazine available to spokesmen of that trend, who attacked the Communists and the Soviet Union as well as the SPA. Nenning fell out with the SPA leadership, and Bruno Kreisky, the Party Chairman, said at the Villach Congress (1968): "While we have no touring harlequins at the court of pseudo-revolution, we have buffoons doing their bit in the journalistic backyard of Austrian reaction."

The word "buffoons" plainly referred to Nenning as a spokesman of the "new Left". However, Kreisky and Nenning made up before the speech was printed. This explains why in the pamphlet containing the speech there is a footnote by Nenning saying that the family quarrel was settled. Kreisky volunteered the following clarification: "Nenning started a controversy with the party in the magazine he publishes. He carried on the dispute in a way injuring our party's prestige. If Nenning is now stopping the controversy in his magazine I see no reason for continuing it. I consider the matter closed thereby."

In *Realists or Traitors?* (1976), Nenning goes further by siding openly with the right-wing Social Democrats. He wants to prove that the latter's stand on the interests of the working class is no betrayal at all. The right-wing Social Democrats have always been realists and have chosen the right road to socialism, he asserts. Without sophistry, Nenning tries to justify all past revisionists of Marxism beginning with Bernstein. "What is the salient aspect of social democracy?" he queries. "Their co-operation with capitalism," he replies (p. 10). "Social democracy is a factor for order in favour of capital. It is a junior partner of capital" (p. 11). However, Nenning does not regard this as a betrayal of

socialism but as a sure and indispensable means of achieving it. "The very fact that capitalism is being advanced into the future with the aid of the Social Democrats makes it possible to change capitalism optimally in the process. Capitalism can be carried forward in the most peaceful democratic, humane and judicious manner until it drops out of history" (ibid).

This is the fundamental idea (if one may call it that) recurring in the book. On page 45, we read: "The working-class movement cannot 'overthrow' capitalism but must carry it forward and through to the end, like a doctor 'at the sickbed'." And on page 47 Nenning describes the Social Democrats' "historic" mission as follows: "By sharing in political and economic power, the Social Democrats gradually push capitalism towards socialism." A capitalism which the Social Democrats have been pushing towards socialism for decades is certainly a fine spectacle.

Now how have the Social Democrats been pushing capitalism towards socialism? From what Nenning says, it is simple enough: "The production process and the process of making profit typical of latter-day capitalism can no longer go on without support from an organised working class. This is the lever of social democracy—capitalism cannot do without it" (p. 40). Kreisky says as much by stating that the SPA is a party adequate to capitalism. Olof Palme, another prominent ideologist of the movement, talks about a symbiosis of capitalism and social democracy. But can such a social democracy fight for the abolition of capitalist production relations if this would rob it of its vital basis? Of course not. During his interview with Nenning, who reproduces it in his book, Kreisky reacted in a most peculiar way to the provision of the SPA programme regarding the establishment of a classless society. Asked whether the Socialists want a "classless society", Kreisky replied, according to Nenning, "It must be left as a working hypothesis" (p. 245).

As we see, the capitalists need the Social Democrats, and vice versa. This is an exceptionally frank and brusque admission of the role of the SPA's right-wing leaders. But then the Social Democratic parties are not made up of leaders alone. They unite hundreds of thousands of wage and salary earners who see socialism as a realistic goal and not a "working hypothesis".

Nenning does not mind admitting an occasional shortcoming of capitalist society. "Freedom of the press (in the capitalist countries.—*F.F.*)," he writes on p. 59, "is the right to fool the masses unhampered. This is an exaggeration but the share of truth is growing fast." Nenning is right on this point. But what do the Social Democrats do, or rather, how do the Social Democratic leaders counter that, in particular where they head the government? Alas, it is they who help zealously to mislead the masses by launching slander campaigns on anti-communist lines. "To renounce it (anti-communism.—*F.F.*) would still be suicidal for parties like the Social Democratic Party of Germany or the SPA" (p. 125).

As for Nenning himself, he recommends as a means of curbing monopoly domination of the media—please don't laugh—statutes establishing editorial rights. As it happens, Austria is a country where bourgeois newspapers have editorial statutes, yet these have not altered the papers' pro-capitalist, anti-Communist and anti-Soviet bias in the least.

Nenning feels that the class struggle has assumed a new character. "Growing out of the old life-and-death class struggle is a new live-and-let-live class

struggle. . . . In the life and death class struggle of the past, a frontal attack on the vital interests of capitalism brought the working class nothing but a series of reverses. But the new live-and-let-live class struggle is leading to the death of capitalism by sparing the latter's vital interests. This is what constitutes the classical function of the growing social power of the working class as the grave-digger of capitalism" (p. 42).

It is amazing how many incorrect and, indeed, absurd things can be said in a short paragraph.

First of all, the class struggle between antagonistic classes is not always a continuous frontal attack even though it is part of a great historic life and death class struggle. Secondly, the working class has achieved big victories and successes, some of them through a frontal attack, and this applies to both countries where capitalism was overthrown and countries where it persists. Thirdly, a class struggle defending the vital interests of capitalism and thereby leading to its death is something that no editorial statutes, however fine, can help to accomplish.

But Nenning's "discoveries" go further than that. He claims that, strictly speaking, all the noted leaders of the working-class movement of the past and present, beginning with Marx, have been or are Social Democrats (meaning reformists). Proud of his discovery and referring to Marx's demand for a legalised normal working day, Nenning writes: "In Marx's principal work (*Capital—F.F.*), puzzlingly for those who do not know it, one finds only this truly 'social democratic demand' " (p. 77). Thus he echoes an Austrian anarchist, who made that allegation in 1927. And this *is* puzzling.

Nenning is certainly not unfamiliar with the following passage in *Capital* (quoted frequently enough by friend and foe): "The monopoly of capital becomes a fetter upon the mode of production, which has sprung up and flourished along with and under it. Centralisation of the means of production and socialisation of labour at last reach a point where they become incompatible with their capitalist integument. This integument is burst asunder. The knell of capitalist private property sounds. The expropriators are expropriated".[2] But strangely enough, he has ignored it ever since Kreisky said in public that he got along very well with the multinationals and that the party led by him was thinking of no expropriation whatever.

For some time now, Nenning has seen nothing but social democracy around him and he declares boldly that the Social Democrats are advancing. After all, he says, the Bolsheviks, too, called themselves Social Democrats during the October Revolution. Speaking of the first country of socialism, Nenning writes: "Co-operation with the capitalist powers is the basis for the survival and continuuous strengthening of the Soviet Union" (p. 27). This is more or less what the opponents of detente say, who would gladly go back to the cold war although realistic-minded members of the bourgeoisie know that the Soviet Union is growing and gaining in strength through its own efforts. As for trade with the capitalist countries, it benefits both sides. In speaking of trade with the capitalists as the basis for the "survival" of real socialism. Nenning is prompted by considerations different from those of the enemies of detente, "Co-operation between the two superpowers—the Soviet Union and the USA—is world political 'social partnership' " (ibid.). This is the idea which Nenning the "leftist" advances and from which he proceeds subsequently. He is undisturbed by the

fact that peaceful coexistence is no class "co-operation" but a form of the cl struggle aimed at preserving and consolidating peace between countries wi different social systems. This distinction means nothing to him. He does n hesitate to equate the Cologne trial of the Communist League (1852) and the tr of the Baader-Meinhof group of anarchist terrorists.

In these circumstances, Nenning's affirmation that the Communist parties the European capitalist countries are becoming social democratic is har surprising.

The evidence cited by Nenning in support of his contention is as ridiculous the contention itself. Assuming that he believes in what he has written, one m say that he has no understanding at all of the Communists' fight for pe against monopoly capital, for democracy and for socialism without arr struggle. Besides, he clearly has no idea of the fact that the class struggle everyday demands, for small and big reforms and for democratic rights i essential part of the Communists' struggle against capitalist dominat Nenning refuses to understand that today the Communists see a way out o capitalist crisis and the road to socialism in the struggle of all working pe against monopoly capital. Stripping the monopolies of power paves the wa the overthrow of capitalist rule and for socialism.

We will not burden the reader's attention with any further specimen Nenning's wisdom. But it is worthy of note that to add substance to his b Nenning has included in it interviews with Willy Brandt, Bruno Kreisky Sergio Segre, the Italian Communist, as well as a letter from Vitaly Vas Soviet scholar from the Institute of the International Working-Class Moven who, incidentally, exposes Nenning's misquoting of Lenin and calls on him "more truthful". However, there is hardly any hope that Nenning will hee call.

Nenning's political biography and his vacillation are a fresh indication ultra-leftist and right-wing revisionism can always take each other's place more Nenning tries his hand at anti-communism, the more he will satis present patron, Kreisky. Speaking to a meeting, Heinz Fischer, chairman SPA parliamentary group, described Nenning's book as a "hot-water bott the SPA's stomach-ache". Yet the water in the bottle is cold.

Friedl Für

---

[1] Günther Nenning, *Realisten oder Verräter? Die Zukunft der Sozialdemokratie*. N Bertelsmann-Verlag, 1976, 255 pp

[2] Karl Marx, *Capital*. Vol. 1, FLPH, Moscow, p. 763.

Chronicle of the Revolution

"Cong San", Journal of Vietnam's Communists

This is the title of a series of articles on the 60th anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution launched by *Vorwärts*, newspaper of the Swiss Party of Labour. The first instalment concerns the February revolution, the overthrow of the tsar's regime and the revolutionary development of Russia before July 1917. It gives special attention to the return of Lenin, leader of the revolution, from foreign exile and to the articles which he wrote at the time and which set the further course of the revolution.

W. Becker

decision of the CC Political Bureau, Communist Party of Vietnam, *Hoc tap* udies), the theoretical and political journal published by the Party since 1956, ; been renamed *Cong san* (The Communist). This change, say the editors in a ssage to the readers, was prompted by the desire to bring the title of the journal ɔ line with the new name of the Party approved by its Fourth Congress. The ssage stresses that *Cong san* stands firm on the revolutionary position of the rking class, a Marxist-Leninist position, creatively applies the advanced ntific theory and propagates CPV policies.

The first issue of the journal opens with an article by Truong Chinh, Political reau member, CC CPV, entitled "Stand Firm on the Positions of the :tatorship of the Proletariat, Promote Collective Economic Management by Working People, Carry Out the Tasks of the Revolution at the New Stage". Nguyen Giap, Political Bureau member, CC CPV, writes about using the ɔple's creative energies in the socialist revolution and in building the new :iety.

The journal also carries theoretical articles on the formation of a new culture in :tnam, the inseparable connection between national independence and :ialism, and ways of setting up large-scale socialist production in the republic.

Y.Y.

The Underground Press in South Africa

E South African Communist Party and African National Congress consider underground press particularly important now that the struggle to free South ica has assumed a vast scale. Interest in the clandestine leaflets, periodicals I pamphlets circulated by patriots in the country is greater than ever. A ticipant in the Soweto rising said at a press conference that he had made up his id to join in the struggle under the influence of leaflets and pamphlets telling ut Nelson Mandela, the renowned freedom fighter.

he amount of literature circulated in South Africa has sharply increased in past decade. *Inkululeko*, an SACP newspaper, *Vukani* and *Amandla-atla*, ANC periodicals, are published regularly. The quarterly *African nmunist* has been published ever since 1959. Since 1971, when a pocket

edition of the quarterly was launched, tens of thousands of copies have been distributed illegally in the country. The Communists also bring out small-size Marxist books (10x7cm). In this way they have produced a series of Marxist-Leninist classics in two of the country's languages: the *Communist Manifesto*, Engels' *Socialism: Utopian and Scientific*, Lenin's *The State and Revolution* and *"Left-wing" Communism—an Infantile Disorder*. The SACP Programme was printed in notebook form. Illegal publications include key resolutions and statements of the Party and *Fifty Fighting Years* (a history of the SACP), which was widely distributed in the country and was an event in itself. Besides, the Party brings out numerous leaflets on events of both domestic and international significance.

The influence of underground literature on Africans is admitted even by the official press. At a recent trial of two journalists charged with printing and distributing clandestine litarature, a secret police "expert" stated that "the SCAP and ANC literally bombarded the country with pamphlets which were inflammatory and attempted to prepare people for an armed struggle to remove the government by force and to institute a new regime". The recent general strike in Cape Town as well as demonstrations and other mass actions in Transvaal were largely a result of reading underground litarature, according to press reports.

In view of the latest developments, South Africa's Communists strive to circulate illegal leaflets, pamphlets, periodicals and books more widely and on a more regular basis so as to raise the people's political awareness. "As with Lenin's *Iskra*," writes *The African Communist* in its latest issue, "our propaganda must become a powerful instrument for organisation serving to unite all those groups committees and cells already linked with the liberation movement, and all those activists who have been pushed into action by the stirring events of the past six months. Our propaganda must be geared even more powerfully to the battle ahead."

N.K

A New Paper

A JOINT meeting of the leading committees of the Rhone, Loire and Iser department federations of the French Communist Party has decided to start publication of a new regional Communist newspaper, to be circulated chiefly in such industrial centres as Lyons, Saint-Etienne and Grenoble. "For the first time in 19 years," said Roland Leroy, Secretary of the CC FCP, Editor-in-Chief of *L'Humanite*, "the workers and other working people of this area will have the paper they need so much. Those who have voted . . . for the Left alliance will have their own paper."

The editorial staff of the paper has already been selected almost completely. Jean Capievic, recently elected mayor of Veaux-en-Velin, has been named editor-in-chief. The first issue is expected to appear in autumn. Subscriptions are being taken.

E. Bric

Diary

AT a meeting of the *WMR* Editorial Council, Faik M. Warrad, First Secretary of the CC, Jordanian Communist Party, spoke of the situation in the Middle East with emphasis on the activity of the Palestine Liberation Organisation. Co-operation between the *WMR* and the JCP was also discussed.

* * *

At a meeting with the *WMR* Editorial Board and Editorial Council members, Abdel Fattah Ismail, General Secretary of the CC, Unified Political Organisation National Front, member of the Presidential Council and Chairman of the Standing Committee of the Provisional Supreme People's Council of the People's Democratic Republic of Yemen, spoke highly of the journal's role in the anti-imperialist struggle and in defence of the principles of socialism, internationalism and national liberation.

* * *

Sebastian Zapirain, member of the CC, Communist Party of Spain, and member of the *WMR* Editorial Council, attended the Fifth Congress of the Socialist Unity Party of West Berlin at the invitation of the Party Executive.

International Photo Competition

"For Peace, Detente and Social Progress"

Problems of Peace and Socialism (World Marxist Review) and the International Organisation of Journalists (IOJ) are conducting an international photographic competition in 1977. Its motto is: For Peace, Detente and Social Progress.

The competition is open to progressive and democratic photojournalists and amateurs of all countries inspired by ideals of the struggle for peace, detente and social progress. The photographs should reflect different aspects of the struggle—its mass character, heroism and humanism.

There will be three main prizes of 6,000, 4,000 and 2,000 Czechoslovak crowns, and winners may choose either goods or cash in Czechoslovak currency. There will also be a number of consolation prizes and diplomas.

The competition will be adjudicated by a jury of representatives of *Problems of Peace and Socialism*, the International Organisation of Journalists and well-known photojournalists.

The best photos will be published in *Problems of Peace and Socialism* and the *Democratic Journalist* in 1977.

Black and white photos, 18 × 24 cm, should have appropriate captions and be marked "Photo competition". Please mention your name, country, the place the picture was taken and at what date. The photos are to be sent to *Problems of Peace and Socialism*, Thakurova 3, Prague 6, Czechoslovakia, not later than October 10, 1977.

Jury of the "For Peace, Detente and
Social Progress" Photo Competition

New Books

H. Burg, *Inflation und Klassenkampf* (Inflation and Class Struggle), Berli Dietz Verlag, 1977, 176 pp.

CONTINUING the series "Criticism of Bourgeois Ideology and Revisionism' this volume analyses inflation, a characteristic trait of capitalist economy, i source and its consequences for millions of working people. The auth examines bourgeois political economic theories that declare inflation to b "general" and "global". Inflation is shown to be a product of the capitali mode of production. It can be stopped only through joint anti-monopo actions by the working class and all working people and the struggle for socialist future.

J. Wawrzyniak, *Rownosc obywateli PRL* (Citizens' Equality in the PPR Warsaw, Panstwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe, 1977. 255 pp.

THE author shows how socialist Poland has applied the Marxist-Lenini concept of equality at various stages of its development. A balanced attitud to public means of production, he points out, is an important precondition c equality. The economic, political and legal aspects of equality are analyse The idea is stressed that by providing all citizens with an equal right to work socialism creates equal opportunities to participate in management of the stat and society.

G. Gribachev, *Nauchno-tecknicheskata revolutsia i problemite na zaetostta bezrabotitsata v razvitite kapitalisticheski strani* (The Scientific and Techno logical Revolution and Problems of Employment and Unemployment in th Developed Capitalist Countries), Sofia, Profizdat, 1976. 171 pp.

THE book analyses unemployment in the capitalist world since the Second World War, the impact of the scientific and technological revolution o employment in differing population strata, and the role of the trade unions i the struggle for the right to work. Several bourgeois "employment" concept are criticised.

V. I. Lenin, *Om Religion* (On Religion), Oslo, Forlaget Ny Dag, 1976. 90 pp

THE volume comprises works on this subject in the period 1905-1922. I reveals the historical, economic and social roots of religion and covers such problems as the attitude of a Marxist party towards religion, co-operation between Marxists and religious people and the relationship between a socialis state and the church.

J. Serekhyova, *Nove formy hospodarskych vztahu mezi zememi dvou southav* (New Forms of Economic Relations Between the States of the Two Systems), Prague, Academia, 1977. 94 pp.

THE book examines new trends in economic relations between the socialist and developed capitalist countries and the various forms of these ties based on the principles of peaceful coexistence. It shows that they are mutually beneficial and important to consolidating detente.